

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. XXVI.

JUNE, 1842.

ARTICLE I.

MR. PARKER'S DISCOURSE.

Discourse on the Transient and the Permanent in Christianity.

By THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury. Boston. 1841.

WE introduce this discourse to the notice of our readers, as a curiosity of this curious age, and as occupying the ultimate ground towards which a certain denomination has long been tending, of denying all authority in matters of religious faith. It is founded on the declaration of our Saviour, Luke 21 : 33, *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.* Its object is to point out what in Christianity is uniform, certain, and of permanent obligation, as compared with what is variable, uncertain and perishing. And it is a curiosity, in this point of view, that it employs substantially the same means of invalidating our confidence in the Bible, as a book of veritable fact and truth, and as deserving of absolute and universal belief, that infidels do ; while it eulogizes the religion it teaches, as the ideal of all man needs or is to expect. In illustration of its identity with infidelity in some of its most essential positions, we will place those of the two side by side, that the reader may judge for himself. This we do, not to affirm that Mr. P. is an infidel, in opposition to his solemn professions to the contrary ; for this might appear uncharitable

and unchristian ; but as evidence of the curious fact, that, within thirty-three years of the death of that celebrated apostle of infidelity, Thomas Paine, a Christian teacher, invested with the canonicals of his office, and standing in the pulpit,

“That most important and effectual guard,
Support and ornament of virtue's cause,”

is found advocating some of the most material positions of the “Age of Reason,” as essential to invest Christianity with its real glory, and to make it seen that “the words of Jesus are the music of heaven, sung in earthly voice.” The following specimens, promiscuously selected, will suffice for our purpose :

MR. PAINE.

“When Moses told the children of Israel that he received the two tables of the commandments from the hands of God, *they were not bound to believe him.*”—*Age of Reason*, pp. 13, 14.

“The church mythologist collected all the writings they could,”—“decided by vote which of them should be the WORD OF GOD, and the belief of the people, since calling themselves Christians, came from this vote.”—p. 20.

“As to the account of the creation, with which the book of Genesis opens, it has all the appearance of being a *tradition*, which the Israelites had among them before they came into Egypt.”—p. 21.

“We ought to feel *shame* at calling such *paltry stories* the word of God.”—p. 21.

“Jesus Christ called men to the practice of moral virtues and the belief of one God. The grand trait of his character is *philanthropy*.”—p. 26.

“The character of the person called Paul, has in it a great deal of *violence and fanaticism* ;” “and, either as a Jew or a Christian, he was the same *zealot*.”—p. 145.

“Solomon's songs are *amorous* and foolish enough, but which wrinkled fanaticism has called divine.” “For Solomon was then

MR. PARKER.

“It has been assumed at the outset, *with no shadow of evidence*, that the Hebrew writers held a miraculous communication with God.”—*Discourse*, p. 13.

“All the books which *caprice or accident had brought together*, between the two lids of the Bible, were declared the *infallible word of God*, the only rule of *faith and practice*.”—p. 15.

“Hence the attempt, which has always failed, to reconcile the philosophy of our times with the *poems* in Genesis, writ a thousand years before Christ.”—p. 14.

“It cannot be the record of fact, unless God is the author of *confusion and a lie*.”—p. 14.

“The *only creed* Christianity lays down is,—*there is a God*.” “It is the *love* of man, the *love* of God, acting without let or hindrance.”—p. 23.

“Paul had a vein of the *marvellous* running quite through him.”—p. 15.

“On the authority of the written word, man has been taught to take a collection of *amatory* idyls for a serious discourse, touching the

MR. PAINE.

in the honey of one thousand debaucheries."—p. 14.

"The *disordered state of the history*" [of the four Evangelists], "the silence of one book upon matters related in the other, and the disagreement that is to be found among them, implies that they are the production of some unconnected individuals, many years after the things they pretend to relate, each of whom made his own *legend*."—p. 128.

"Euclid's geometry challenges universal belief; and the reason is, because it is a book of self-evident propositions. But it is quite otherwise with the books ascribed to Moses and the other Jewish writers. They are books of *testimony*."—p. 71.

"*Human language is incapable of being used as a means of unchangeable and uniform information*; and therefore it is *not the means that God useth* in manifesting himself universally to man."—p. 31.

"The creation speaketh an universal language, independently of human speech or language, multiplied and various as they be. It *preaches to all nations*, and this *word of God* reveals to man all that is necessary for him to know of God." "It is only by the exercise of *reason* that man can discover God."—p. 132.

"Take away from Genesis the belief that Moses was the author, on which only the strange belief that it is the word of God has stood, and there remains nothing of Genesis but an anonymous book of *stories, fables and traditionary or invented absurdities*, or of *downright lies*."—p. 80.

MR. PARKER.

mutual love of Christ and the church."—p. 13.

"Some pious hearts have long felt that *errors of doctrine and errors of fact* may be found in many parts of the record, here and there, from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts."—p. 18.

"It is hard to see why the truth of Christianity should rest on the personal *authority* of Jesus, more than the axioms of geometry rest on the personal authority of Euclid. The authority of Jesus, as of all teachers, must rest on the truth of his word, and not their truth on his authority."—p. 16.

"Christianity does not continue to stand through the forbearance of some *critic, who can cut, when he will, the thread on which its life depends*." "To me it seems presumptuous for the believer to claim this evidence for its truth," that is, the evidence of the sacred text.—p. 18.

"Now there can be but one religion which is absolutely true, *existing in the facts of human nature and the ideas of Infinite God*. That, whether acknowledged or not, *never changes*." [Same in all nations.]—p. 10. "It is true, like the axioms of geometry, because it is true, and is to be tried by the *oracle God places in the breast*."—p. 19.

Of parts of the same book, Mr. Parker says, "It is an *oriental story, written down nobody knows when, or by whom, or for what purpose*," which make "the flesh crawl with horror."—p. 14.

Both Mr. Paine and Mr. Parker eulogize the character of Jesus as a model of integrity and benevolence, the latter especially pouring forth some fine strains of thought on the subject; though both esteem him a mere man, and distinguished for nothing which is not accessible to the good and the diligent of all ages and nations.

MR. PAINE.

"Nothing here said can apply to the real character of Jesus. He was a virtuous and amiable man. The morality that he preached and practised, was of the *most benevolent kind*."—p. 15.

MR. PARKER.

"His life is the perpetual rebuke of all time since. It condemns ancient civilization; it condemns modern civilization. Wise men we have had, and good men; but this Galilean youth strode before the world whole thousands of years."—p. 21.

Both, however, agree in regarding the miraculous part of his story as fabulous.

"Between the Jews and Romans this virtuous reformer and revolutionist lost his life." "It is upon this plain narrative of facts, that the Christian mythologists, calling themselves the Christian church, have erected their *fable, which for absurdity and extravagance, is not exceeded by any thing that is found in the mythology of the ancients*."—p. 17.

"Men have been bid to close their eyes at the obvious difference between Luke and John; the serious disagreement between Paul and Peter; to believe, on the *slightest evidence, accounts which shock the moral sense, and revolt the reason, and tend to place Jesus in the same series with Hercules, and Apollonius of Tyana*."—pp. 14, 15.

And, as to the charge of infidelity, Mr. Paine ingeniously throws it back upon the Christians for professing to credit things that defy belief; while Mr. Parker contents himself with fulminating his shafts at the bigotry and slander of those who would impute infidelity to him and his friends, for merely separating the elements from the accidents of Christianity.

"Infidelity does not consist in believing or disbelieving; it consists in professing to believe what a man does not believe."—p. 12.

"Men who cry down the absurdities of Paganism in the worst spirit of the French free-thinkers, call others infidels and atheists, who point out, though reverently, other absurdities which men have piled upon Christianity," alluding to "statements" of the Scriptures themselves.—p. 15.

Considering the difference in the character of the two men, and in the object of their writing, these coincidences are certainly among the most surprising curiosities of literature. The one, the bitterest infidel of the past age, writing to overthrow Christianity,—the other, a professed successor of the holy apostles, standing in a Puritan pulpit, where, whilom, the least squinting towards skepticism would have been treated with pious horror, and, in prosecution too of the sacred functions of the place. If these two documents, one of the past and the other of the present age, were the only relics of literature that should survive to tell our story to the hundredth generation to come, how could they fail to conclude, that, if Mr. Paine had not annihilated our Christian theology, he had at least brought it round substantially to his own measure of thinking?

It is no uncommon thing for infidels to assume the aspect of benevolence, and to profess themselves influenced by the single desire of freeing the world from the shackles of a hoary superstition. Voltaire and his associates presented themselves before France and the world as the liberators of an oppressed people; while the professed representatives of Jesus and his apostles occupied the position of the scribe and priest, neither entering the gates of knowledge themselves, nor suffering them that would. Still, they never dreamed of identifying their ideal of virtue and truth with Christianity. The thought seems not to have crossed their minds, to take advantage of the public veneration for the inspired writers, by representing their own teaching as identical with all that is excellent, pure and exalted in these venerated models, and as hostile only to "their puerile conceptions of God," their pretence to a foreknowledge they did not possess, in "predicting things that have not been fulfilled;" "the cruel denunciations that disfigure their pages," "their contradictions," and to "their legends, so beautiful as fiction, so appalling as fact." See Parker's Discourse, page 19. Had it occurred to them, they would no doubt have deemed it the more direct, because the more effectual road to the attainment of their object. Even Paine, in his *Age of Reason*, which the world have hitherto regarded as an attack upon the Bible with intent to destroy, substantially accords to its pages all that Mr. Parker deems of permanent and universal value and obligation.

Mr. P. in common with many others of his sect, is beginning to reap a harvest, which various influences have for years been bringing to perfection. Extremes follow each other. The religion of the Pilgrim fathers was tinged with superstition. The writings of the Mathers, the blue laws, the fate of witches under their infant polity, and the record of their criminal jurisprudence, prove this. Carrying their notions of the intervention of supernatural agency to an extreme, therefore, what is more natural than a reaction, terminating in a denial of *all* such intervention, and of every thing in religion which depends *solely* on documentary evidence? The mathematician's word is not taken for the truth of his axioms, we are told, and why should we be required to rest our religious belief on bare authority? Thus the pendulum has swung from superstition to skepticism.

And this peculiar tendency has been further strengthened by the ruin which has come over creeds, platforms and articles of faith, that now stand before our view, not as temples crowded with living multitudes paying homage at their shrines, but as the forsaken castles of a darker age, in whose dilapidated halls the bat, the owl and all doleful creatures riot undisturbed. We have learned to look with distrust and regret upon these proud monuments of superstition, and to abhor them as manacles upon the freeborn mind. Nor is it surprising, that the wreck of confidence in things that once wielded such an absolute sway over the religious convictions of mankind, should give rise to a sect whose distinguishing characteristic is the rejection of all authority, as insufficient in itself to warrant religious belief; thus consigning the Bible to the general fate of human creeds and formularies. The liberalizing tendency of science and literature, also, over the New England mind, has no doubt done much to impart to this "sect," what Mr. P. calls its "nationalizing" character. These causes have been aided in their operation by that fondness for religious philosophizing, which has always been conspicuous in the divines of New England. From no part of the world have deeper works on the metaphysics of religion emanated, than from its alluvial valleys and its iron-bound shores.

As Baptist reviewers, also, we might find much in the structure of the Pilgrim churches, to account for the growth of the denomination in question. Infant baptism, the half-way

covenant, union of church and state, and too little regard to piety, formerly, as a qualification in candidates for the ministry, have all had their influence. We say this from no disrespect to either of the parties upon whom our remarks have a bearing; for we are happy in living with both on terms of reciprocal friendship, and in acknowledging the many excellences by which they are adorned; but we speak honestly the convictions of our own minds, and from motives of Christian love and faithfulness. It is with religion as with poetry; it has its numbers and its soul. Measure, rhyme, and the due adjustment of words may be attained by those who are devoid of the soul of poetry. But not more unlike the living man is his form in marble, than such productions are to the inspiring strains of the real muse. The fable of the harp of Orpheus drawing after it rocks and trees, converting the ferociousness of the lion into the mildness of the lamb, and hushing the tempest to a calm, is realized in him who has the soul of poetry. To him every thing in history, nature and the universe of thought puts on aspects of beauty, loveliness and splendor, or of deformity and terribleness, which, to an unpoetical eye, would seem foreign to their nature.

So in religion, there is an interior life, a heavenly glow, an unearthly feeling of actual contact with God, such as President Edwards describes in himself, as a sense of being somewhere in the mountains alone with God, which, when they are enjoyed, give to the Bible a vitality and power, to which another mind equally conversant with its statements, would be utterly insensible. To the first, every page, from Genesis to Revelation, is illuminated; every promise comes certified to him by the attributes of the infinite God, and he can rest his all upon it,—every fragment, however miraculous, contains the evidence of the present Divinity, vindicating his own name, redressing the wrongs of his injured people, and furthering the great designs of redemption; and every doctrine, fact and truth stands as a rock to sustain his hopes for eternity, secure from the beating storms of temptation that come over him in this bleak world. And who that has read the productions of a mind like Bunyan's, whose intellectual, as well as spiritual aliment was drawn almost exclusively from the pages of the Bible, has not been surprised by the richness, variety and compass of his thinking, and edified by the precious thoughts which he drew from the most barren

chapters, as Samson drew the refreshing stream that quenched his maddening thirst from the dry bone, with which he had slain a thousand men? But to those who view the Scriptures with other eyes, all appears visionary, doubtful, and unavailable to any purpose of utility.

Now, it is not surprising, that an ecclesiastical constitution, which gives free admission to both these classes of mind, should be followed by a rupture like that in the family of Abraham, when he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born by promise. Whichever of these characters, and whichever of these opposite views of the Bible are the true ones, still, this result could not fail of being realized, sooner or later, from the want of affinity between them. To prevent such a rupture, it was necessary to have acted from the beginning, on a principle in church building that should have discountenanced the unnatural alliance. Is not the church to be built only of lively stones, a spiritual house, to offer up, not carnal, but spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ? The principle that the natural offspring of believing parents, may, by the *bare* administration of a visible rite, be brought into a relationship to the spiritual kingdom, that cannot be enjoyed by other children, who have had equal advantages for a Christian education, and are equally the children of faith, so far as parental piety and diligence are concerned, has, in our humble opinion, wrought greater mischief, directly to the church and indirectly to mankind, than any other form of abomination that ever stood in the holy place.

This principle is both the parent and the child of the Roman hierarchy; the parent, because it encouraged those admissions of carnal men into the bosom of the church, by which it was corrupted, and converted into a vast engine of worldly power and dominion; and the child, because when that power was consolidated, the edicts of its popes, ecumenical councils, and the writings of its so called fathers, supplied the basis on which it rests, all agreeing that it has in the Bible the authority neither of an express command nor a positive example. Propping it by the law of circumcision, that sign of Hebrew nationality, is resting the practice on the very principle of which we are complaining, that of supposing that being born after the flesh, does, under certain circumstances, *in itself considered*, afford a title to the blessings of one who

is born of the Spirit. This law, which entitled every natural born descendant of Abraham to an introduction by circumcision into the civil polity which God had established as a sign of good things to come, is the very one of which designing statesmen have availed themselves in rearing up those politico-ecclesiastical organizations, which have held the millions of Europe in bondage more than a thousand years, and still cast disastrous twilight over a third part of the nations. Natural birth is deemed a sufficient ground of introduction to the church by baptism, the same as it entitles to citizenship in the state; and thus, whole nations, with all their unwashed pollution, are thrown, by this principle, into the church, as the common receptacle of every thing impure. Thus, the bride of Christ loses her character of purity and light, is invested with worldly pomp and circumstance, glitters like a harlot in borrowed plumes, and, instead of being the almoner of heavenly bounty to a suffering race, exists not but to brutalize and enslave mankind.

The greatest precaution in guarding the church against the admission of unregenerated persons may, indeed, not always prove successful, and she may become secularized and worldly under the most careful regimen. Alas! how strong is the tendency with us all to begin in the spirit, but end in the letter. But who does not see, that the danger from this quarter must be greatly increased, by acting on a principle in church building, that admits persons to its spiritual privileges on merely natural grounds, forgetting that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit? We are happy to say, that infant baptism, as it now exists among the Protestant denominations of this country, has lost most of its odious features, and involves little more than a promise on the part of parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. And as we love our brethren, so we shall continue to pray that they may realize that this promise is fully included in their own profession of faith, and needs no invention of the papistical fathers to render it more binding.

But to return, Mr. P. has certainly said some fine things in his discourse. We like his tone of liberality; and, had he excepted the Bible, we could have subscribed to most of his opinions of "the Christianity which has been preached and believed." Much that claims a Christian origin shows

stronger marks of having come from Olympus, or Mecca, than from Mount Zion. But we cannot think with him, that this "actual Christianity," as he calls it, "sustains the same relation to the eternal truth of God, that the phenomena of outward nature, such as sunshine and cloud, growth, decay and reproduction, bear to the great law of nature which underlies and supports them all."—p. 8. What! Catholic indulgences, inquisitorial tribunals dooming their innocent victims to a horrid death, on the bare suspicion of recreancy to the faith of the holy mother church, and every abomination which has been practised under the name of Christianity, sustaining to Christianity itself the relation of outward nature to its hidden laws! Impossible! how can the same fountain send forth both sweet water and bitter? This is a stretch of liberality to which we cannot subscribe.

It seems to be the peculiar characteristic of Mr. P.'s mind, to resign himself to the seductions of a flowing style, at the expense of careful analysis into the principles at the basis of his subject. From his youth up, his taste, like that of the bee, has probably been attracted by flowers. And he has given us some very pretty specimens from his collection. He speaks of some who would persuade us, "that religion is to wing her way sublime, above the flight of Christianity, far away, as the fledged eaglet leaves for ever the nest that sheltered his callow youth."—p. 5. "As a river springs up in the heart of a sandy continent, having its father in the skies, and its birth-place in the distant, unknown mountains; as the stream rolls on, enlarging itself, making in that dried waste a belt of verdure wherever it turns its way; creating palm-groves and fertile plains, where the smoke of the cottager curls up at even-tide, and noble cities send the gleam of their splendor far into the distant sky,—such has been the course of the Bible on earth."—p. 20. Mr. P. has strewn these elaborate ornaments more or less over all his pages, and yet, we presume, his stock is not exhausted.

But a gorgeous diction is not always the organ of discriminating thought, any more than a beautiful flower is the sure promise of a valuable fruit. Thought is a diamond, whose lustre we choose not to have obscured, no, not by a verbiage, gaudy and beautiful as the pink and the rose. His sermon partakes of the character of a eulogy upon the word of Jesus; and yet he takes little pains to acquaint his readers

with the sense in which he uses the term, and indeed is fluctuating and indeterminate in his application of it. On one page, he praises a thing as the permanent word of Jesus, which on another, he imputes to the folly, incredulity, or impiety of the sacred writers. Hence, his eloquent panegyric labors under the disadvantages of a funeral oration before an audience, who are not informed as to the individual for whom it is intended. Amid the balancings of conjecture, therefore, between a hundred individuals who have lately died, the effect of his fine tropes, exquisite touches, and pathetic appeals is nearly lost upon them. This is no uncommon thing in the religious reasonings of all classes.

Does Mr. P. use the term "word" as synonymous with truth, and understand our Saviour to affirm that heaven and earth should sooner pass away, than that what he had spoken should be found false? We conjecture not, because on page 6, he applies the term to the New Testament, and says, that "the words" of which he is speaking, "are translated into every human speech." And this he notices as evidence of their permanency. But on page 18, he supposes "errors of doctrine and errors of fact may be found in many parts of the record, here and there, from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts." And as these errors have been as widely translated, and hitherto as enduring as their truths, it follows, that the term "word," in Mr. P.'s use of it, cannot be a synonym for truth.

Or, does he understand our Saviour to affirm of his own teaching, as distinguished from the record which his apostles should give of it, that it should remain true when heaven and earth had passed away? This seems to have been Paine's idea, that all that Jesus himself did and taught was virtuous, philanthropic and excellent, but that his apostles are the guilty ones, for making such a ridiculous fable out of the simple story of his life and death. But Mr. Parker intimates on page 19, that Jesus himself might have been "mistaken, as some Christians think he was, when he predicted his second coming;" and he seems to be of the number of whom he speaks on page 16, as believing that Christ was no otherwise inspired, than "we may be, if we will pay the price." Mr. P., therefore, plainly does not use his term "word" for the teaching of Jesus, as distinguished from the apostolic record; for he does not deem even that in all respects permanent in

the sense of being true. And yet, from his rapturous praises of his teaching, one would naturally think, that he accorded to it, at least, the merit of being free from mistakes.

Or, does Mr. P. understand the permanent word of Christ to include both the part that was true and the part that was false? His errors, as well as his truths, might be supposed to survive the decay of heaven and earth, in the sense of outliving other forms of thought and worship, just as Paganism, beginning in the unknown depths of a recreant antiquity, has survived all revolutions to this day, and how much longer it will continue, who can foresee? But Mr. P. evidently designs to apply the expression to something better than that medley of facts and fiction of which, he says, the Bible is composed; but his ideas are so blurred and indeterminate, that he sometimes applies it to the one, sometimes to the other, and sometimes to both. If his object was to embrace in it only so much as is true, he ought to have supplied us with the test for distinguishing it from the part that is false, or stated "the price" at which we may purchase a more infallible inspiration than that of Jesus. Till he gives us a rule that we may rely upon in selecting the part of the Bible which is true and permanent, from the part that deserves to be thrown away as false and pernicious, his discourse will leave the minds of his readers in confusion, as to the lines which separate the one from the other.

In his explication of his subject, so far as he has given any, he seems to confine the term "word" to the vocal sounds which our Saviour used in conveying his ideas. "At first sight," he says, "nothing seems more fleeting than a word. It is an evanescent impulse of the most fickle element. It leaves no track where it went through the air. Yet to this, and this only did Jesus entrust the truth, wherewith he came laden to the earth; truth for the salvation of the world."—pp. 5, 6. What! the undulations which Christ produced in the air by his vocal organs, the "*only*" thing to which he trusted his truth! He wrote nothing, it is true; but had his actions, his sufferings, and his miracles no part of this trust? Did not the deeds and incidents of his life, the touching scene of his final passion, his triumphant resurrection, and glorious ascension, all of which were witnessed by his personal followers, do as much to chisel upon the tablet of their character and memory that impression of him which con-

verted them from rustic fishermen, into bold and magnanimous leaders of the hosts of God, in their warfare upon the consecrated and entrenched wickedness of all the world? Ay, the weakest of them fearlessly rushed to the deadly breach, measured swords with the consolidated strength of all nations, and, gloriously shedding the last drop of his life's blood, "conquered by the irresistible might of weakness." These are facts that bespeak the presence of an energy which confounds all our experience of the connections of cause and effect. They can be accounted for only by such a history as the four evangelists describe that of Jesus of Nazareth to have been. Was it to words only that Peter ascribed the energy that had wrought in him through life, when, girding himself for martyrdom, he took pains that after his decease his brethren might have these things always in remembrance? On the contrary, does he not tell them plainly, "We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye-witnesses* of his majesty?" And the aged John speaks, not only of what he had heard, but of what his *eyes had seen*, what he had *looked* upon, and his *hands handled* of the good word of life.

But Mr. P. is one of those who do not agree with Peter and John, having found means of correcting their testimony of the matters of fact that had passed under the observation of their senses; and hence, he believes that most of the story of these apostles was a "fable," and this probably accounts for his idea that Jesus entrusted his truth to words only. And yet, he speaks of the life of Jesus, as if that might have had some share in illustrating and perpetuating his truth; so that, in charity to him, we think his vision was so obscured by an ornate drapery, as to be in a manner disqualified for tracing his ideas to their ultimate issues. The least reflection is sufficient to show any one, that in point of fact, the acts and sufferings of our Saviour had an important share with his words, in leaving behind him at his ascension, that impression of his history that has made it perpetual, and given his words to immortality. And to this accords the instruction of the angel who released Peter and John from prison, "Go," says he, "stand and speak in the temple all the *words* of this *life*."

And when we come to Mr. P.'s definitions of the permanent in religion, we find them so destitute of philosophical

discrimination, that we are more than ever convinced that he had no clear idea of the principles at the basis of his subject. We now speak of the merit of his production in a literary, and not a theological point of view. "There can be but one religion," he says, "which is absolutely true, existing in the facts of human nature and the ideas of infinite God. That, whether acknowledged or not, is always the same. So far as a man has any religion,—either the principle or the sentiment thereof,—so far he has that by whatever name he might call it."—p. 10. Or, as he expresses it elsewhere, this is the law that underlies and supports all the outward manifestations of religion, Pagan, Mahometan, Jewish, and Christian.

He doubtless alludes here to those elementary tendencies to religion, which distinguish man from the inferior animals. And it is true, these are at the basis of all religious manifestations, just as the perceiving faculty is the basis of all our ideas. But then, why should Mr. P. say of the religious elements of our constitution, that they are "the only religion which is absolutely true?" In strict propriety of speaking, they are no religion at all, any more than the power of loving is love, or the power of knowing is knowledge, or the organ of vision is seeing. Religion sustains to the power in us of exercising it, the relation of seeing to our eyes; it is the exercise of the organ or power. And as the eye is liable to spectral illusions and various deceptions in seeing, so the religious organ, if we may so call it, is liable to innumerable fallacies both in the nature and in the objects of its exercises. And the word of Christ (as also that of other teachers of religion) sustains to this organ the relation of light to our eyes; it is the element without which it could not perform its functions. The religious elements of our constitution could no more be developed without instruction of some sort, Pagan, Mahometan, Jewish, or Christian, than our reason could be developed in the absence of every thing extraneous to the mind itself. And the character of that development, like that of all our other faculties, must depend upon the truth or falsehood of the influences under which it is promoted. So that Mr. P.'s idea that the bare *exercise* of the religious elements is the only true religion, is as preposterous as to call these *elements* themselves the only true religion. Suppose we were to call an exercise of the perceiving faculty the only true knowledge, would there be the least sense

in the statement? Do not insane persons have this exercise as well as others, while they have in fact no true knowledge at all? The true religion is the right exercise of our religious powers, in view of the right object, and under the influence of true principles of religious belief, just as the true knowledge consists in having our ideas conformed to existing relations and things, or to their archetypes in nature. In other words, true religion is obedience to the true God, and cannot by any force of construction be made to consist in the blind homage which the Pagan pays to his gods, any more than the Chinese ideas of geography, or the Burman and Hindoostanee theory of astronomy and the universe, can be esteemed the true science of the earth and heavens. For Mr. P. to say, therefore, on the strength of the bare fact, that the adoption of all religions is to be referred to the same religious tendencies of man's nature, that so far as he exercises these tendencies at all, he has "the true religion" under "whatever name he may call it;" is just as preposterous as to say, that, because all the theories of geography and astronomy that now exist, or have ever existed, are to be referred to the same reasoning faculty by which man is distinguished from the unreasoning brutes, therefore, they are all alike the true science or the true knowledge.

As words are the ordinary channel for conveying instruction, our Saviour applies the term to the truth which he came to impress upon us by precept and example. His appeal was to our religious susceptibilities, as when we hold up a picture to an individual, our appeal is to his eyes. If he had no eyes we should not hold up the picture to him; and if we had no basis for religion in us, Christ would have imparted no such instruction. For Mr. P., therefore, to put the power in us of exercising religion, in place of the truth which Christ came to teach to assist us in that exercise, and to say that this power is the only religion which is absolutely true, and of course is the only element in the word of Jesus which is permanent, is confounding all distinctions, and adding nonsense to nonsense. Suppose we were to insist that the philosophy of Socrates is permanent, and some one should ask in what sense, and we should reply, in those facts and ideas of the human mind which enabled his pupils to apprehend it, should we not talk nonsense? What have the facts and ideas which qualify the mind to apprehend a philosophy, to do

with philosophy itself? And what propriety would there be in calling these "facts and ideas" the only philosophy which is "absolutely true."

On page 23, Mr. Parker gives us another definition of the permanent word of Jesus, which is equally wide of the truth, and equally wanting in discrimination. "Christianity," he says, "is a simple thing; very simple. It is absolute, pure morality; absolute, pure religion; the love of man; the love of God, acting without let or hindrance. The only creed it lays down is the great truth which springs up spontaneous in every holy mind,—there is a God. Its watchword is, be perfect as your Father in heaven. The only form it demands is a divine life; doing the best things, in the best way, from the highest motives; perfect obedience to the great law of God." Here he shifts his ground from the power of exercising religion, to the end which Christianity proposes in the education of that power. "The *end* of the commandment," meaning, as Bloomfield thinks, "the revelation of the gospel," "is *ἀγάπη*, love out of a pure heart and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." That is, the end of Christianity is to bring the soul of man into harmony with the law requiring supreme love to God and equal love to man.

But to reveal the end is a small matter compared with that of supplying the efficiency for regaining it. The end of the American Revolution was independence, and the means to it was a seven years' war. So, perfect love is the end of Christianity, while the facts, doctrines, ordinances and ecclesiastical polity to which Jesus and his apostles affixed their seal, are the means to its accomplishment. To define the permanent in Christianity, therefore, as "absolute, pure morality," or "the divine life of the soul, love to God, and love to man," is about as rational as to define the American Revolution by independence, or an arch by its key-stone. Christianity is the embodying of God's idea of the true mode of bringing man back to the divine law, as the rule of his life and the guide of his whole being.

If Mr. Parker had inquired into the state of a mind in conformity with the divine law, and into the efficiency for bringing it into that state, he would have seen the absurdity of his definition. He would have asked himself, where lies the energy for this work? What are the truths with which Jesus came to furnish us for its accomplishment? and he

would have been in as little danger of defining Christianity by conformity to the law, as of defining the art of the builder by the just proportions and orderly arrangements of the house which he has erected. But this process is foreign to the habits of a transcendentalist, because it would clip the wings of his bold flight and bring him down to the common-place routine of fact and evidence. Whereas, his way is among the chaotic elements of subtle and undefined thought, like Milton's hero, who "spread his sail-broad vans for flight,"

"And in the surging smoke
Uplifted spurns the ground; thence many a league,
As in a cloudy chair, ascending, rides
Audacious; but that seat soon failing, meets
A vast vacuity, all unawares,
Fluttering his pennons vain, plumb down he drops
Ten thousand fathoms deep; and to this hour
Down had been falling, had not ill chance,
The strong rebuff of some tumultuous cloud,
Instinct with fire and nitre, hurried him
As many miles aloft."

Never was description of modern transcendentalist more exact. Amid the gas, vacuum and smoke of unmeaning terms,

"Nigh foundering on he fares,
Treading the crude consistence, half on foot,
Half flying; behooves him now both oar and sail."

Let us, therefore, enjoy for a few moments the luxury of treading on solid ground. Let us take a real man, and inquire what state his faculties must be in, to constitute conformity to the law, a thing that cannot exist in the abstract, but is always predicable of an agent in whom the elements of accountableness cohere. What is the *primary* feature of this conformity, this "absolute, pure morality?" Does it consist in bringing the *outward developments* of the man under restraint, by inducing in him temperance in his eating and drinking, chastity in the exercise of his sexual affections, respect for the rights of property, character and life, and a general observance of the laws of strict integrity and uprightness? No; for so much as this is attained by persons in whom the idea of a God is scarcely developed, or who regard not his claims in any thing. Whereas, according to Mr. Parker's definition, love to God is a primary element of this absolute, pure morality.

Again, does enlisting the *convictions of the reason* in favor of the law, constitute the primary feature of conformity to it? No; for this, in the absence of other things, only makes the man proportionably more wicked. The more clear are our views of duty, the greater is our guilt in neglecting it. The superior guilt of the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, over that of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, was owing to the superior development of the idea of a God and of moral obligation in their minds.

Again, is a state of *excited sensibility* in favor of the law, the primary idea of obedience to it? Certainly not. For, so far from its being a sign of perfection of character to be controlled by the feelings or emotions, it is generally esteemed a mark of weakness and guilt. The good nature of the drunken father may lead him to gratify his children to their injury; and thus, though he betrays more of the emotion of parental love, than another father who consults only the good of his children, yet every one would deem him the more deficient of the two in the duties of that relation. Emotions of love or approval of the divine law may be awakened by causes of which self-seeking is as much the basis, as of those which awaken the miser's emotions towards his gold. They may arise from our being pressed down under a sense of fear, or any other painful exercise, weighing upon the spirits and embittering our lives; till at length we suddenly conceive the idea that God is willing to pardon us, and bestow upon us every good for this world and the world to come; and, as a consequence, the clouds disperse and leave the sun of hope beaming sweetly upon our souls. Hence, we determine to serve God, when the reasonableness of that service, the infinite fitness of the divine law as a rule of life, or the glory of the divine holiness, is at the farthest possible remove from our thoughts. Our religion is a bare feeling, and that must, from the nature of the case, be variable in the present connection of mind with matter; and hence, we shall recede from it as soon as this feeling loses its intensity, and we become the victim of counteracting emotions.

Now, we conceive that the primary element of conformity to the divine law, consists in the *choice* or *intention* of the mind to conform to it every thing which is susceptible of being controlled by the choice. It is this faculty of our natures, sometimes called the will, that gives a moral quality

to our actions, it being impossible for us to feel accountable for any thing that we cannot make different by choosing it. The bodily organs and appetites, the intellectual faculties, as well as the feelings or emotions, are all, in some degree, subject to the control of our wills ; so that when we choose, we can walk or sit still, we can direct our minds to this, that, or the other subject, and we can summon to our aid courage, or yield to cowardice, can exercise patience, or indulge fretfulness, and thus can subordinate our sensibility, by due care, to the higher decisions of the reason and the conscience. And it is owing to this subjection of the faculties to the dominion of the agent, that he is made responsible for his thoughts, his affections, and passions, and his bodily exercises ; and this power of controlling himself constitutes the exact limit of his accountableness. Where that ends, this ends also.

Now, the *primary* feature of conformity to the holy law, consists in having this power of choice exerted in accordance with God's will, so that we shall will as he wills, in every thing wherein his will is known to us. He works in us to *will* and to *do* of his good pleasure. When we know how far God would have us indulge our bodily organs and appetites, we must be prepared to say, Lord, I will go so far and no further ; when we understand the designs of his providential government, we must acquiesce, and learn in whatever situation we are therewith to be content ; when our social obligations are unfolded to us, we must instantly abide by them at every expense of our previous arrangements of pleasure, business, or gain ; when the self-denials and various means of keeping ourselves in the love of God are brought to our view, we must reply, Yes, Lord, I approve, and will abide by thy plan of leading a holy life ; and thus, from our deliberate choice and purpose, we must consecrate to God our whole being for time and eternity. Any thing short of this is not willing to have the will of God done ; it is selfishness ; it is a warfare on God's constitution of government, whose distinguishing characteristic is devotion to the supreme good. This is the perfect love that extinguishes fear, and casteth out of the breast all corroding anxieties, filling their place with the sweet harmony and bliss of heaven.

That such must be the *primary* element of conformity to the law, we know from this, that virtue and vice are predicable, not of the body, nor of the understanding, nor of the

feelings, but of the intentions. The drunkard's crime does not consist in his appetite ; for that is merely his temptation ; but in his purpose of indulging it. Its existence, provided he resisted it, would heighten our idea of his virtue. The benevolent sympathy which we feel for a person in distress, does not constitute an act of charity, though it may impel to such act ; but charity is the intention carried out, in doing what will be for his relief. Hence we are required to love, not in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth. As the intention of the mind controlling the man, therefore, and not the convictions of his understanding, nor his excited emotions, is what constitutes his virtue or his vice, his blame or praiseworthiness, this must be the primary element of conformity to the divine law.

Moreover, the very *terms* of the law contemplate its fulfilment in this attitude of the will. It requires us to love God with all our heart, soul, might, mind and strength. This cannot mean the whole might of our emotions of love, but the whole might and strength of our voluntary powers. That is, we are to exert our understandings, our sensibility, our bodily organs, and every thing within and without, as subject to the control of our wills, for the glory of God, and in subordination to his known pleasure. The beating of our hearts, our constitutional appetites and desires, and many other things pertaining to both our persons and circumstances, could not be made otherwise by our willing it ; consequently the law imposes on us no responsibility concerning them. The law requires only that we should love up to the full extent of our voluntary powers, so that whether we eat, or drink, or whatever we do, we should *do* all to the glory of God. Willing or choosing is a primary element in the idea of doing.

Now, Christianity, as a system of religion, is the means authorized by Heaven for bringing the will into this attitude, which is no otherwise a part of it, than as a revelation of the end to be gained, in order to make man holy and happy. And as the choice is determined by truths in view of the mind, in connection with the desires, or excitements of the sensibility, the word of Christ includes those considerations which he has embodied in his gospel, for the purpose of giving the choice of sinful man such a direction as the law prescribes. Are we, therefore, to suppose with Mr. Parker, that Jesus has suspended this result on no particular system

of means, but left men to work it out through devotion to Paganism, Romanism, Judaism, Protestantism, or in any other way that might suit the caprice of the different nations? We must leave this question for another article, in which we propose to show that, *Christian morality cannot subsist apart from Christian doctrine.*

ARTICLE II.

BUNYAN'S HOLY WAR.

Bunyan's Holy War. Published by the American Sunday School Union. Philadelphia.

THE leading incidents in the life of that "ingenious dreamer," and devout allegorist, John Bunyan, are familiarly known to the religious public. An extended biographical notice, therefore, will not be necessary. He was born at Elstow, a village near Bedford, in England, in 1628. His parents, though very poor, were honest and industrious, and early put their son to school, where he learned to read and write. He was bred to the occupation of his father, which was that of a tinker or brazier, and pursued this branch of business for a time in and around Bedford. At the age of seventeen, he enlisted into the army, and was engaged in the wars of that revolutionary period. It was here that he acquired the knowledge, the experience, and language of a soldier, without which he could never have written his "Holy War."

In the early life of Bunyan, there was a strange mingling of religious terrors and vicious practices. He was much addicted to some of the grosser vices, particularly profane swearing and lying; and yet he was never free from the alarms of conscience, and those arrows of conviction which are often darted into the guilty soul. A dreadful sound was in his ears. He was scared with dreams, and terrified with visions, and found in his own experience a full verification of the prophet's maxim, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."

Before he was twenty years of age, Bunyan married a young woman, who was as poor as himself; but she was the daughter of pious parents, had been religiously educated, and brought him two or three good religious books. It was to her society and influence, her connections and books, that Bunyan ascribes his first permanent desires to lead a holy life. These desires prompted him, as they commonly do persons in similar circumstances, to a reformation of his outward conduct. He abandoned the grosser vices, became serious, attended church, and began to think himself a very religious man.

Out of this state of Pharisaical delusion, he was awakened by the conversation of some poor but pious females, whom he heard discoursing about their miserable state by nature,—about a work of God in their hearts, which they called the new birth,—about the love of Christ which had been shed abroad in their souls by the Holy Spirit, and those precious promises which refreshed, comforted and supported them against the temptations of the devil. All this was new and strange to Bunyan, and satisfied him at once that, notwithstanding his apparent seriousness and goodness, he was still an utter stranger to real, spiritual religion.

For many months subsequent to this period, the exercises of his mind were various, but mostly of the gloomy, distressing kind. In his case, a warm and vigorous imagination, awakened sensibilities, and a tender conscience, were united with profound ignorance both of the Scriptures and of scriptural truth. Of such a temperament, the great adversary was permitted to take advantage, to perplex and torment him. His heated imagination became the inlet of all sorts of missiles from the cruel tempter; and while the arrows stuck fast in his susceptible spirit, he knew no way in which to extract them, or to heal the wound. It is painful to read the account of his protracted trials and sorrows; and yet it is interesting to see him led along, from step to step, and from strength to strength, in a way which he knew not, and by an invisible hand. Bunyan, at this time, had little human teaching that was of service to him; but he was preeminently taught of the Holy Spirit. And the Spirit seems to have kept him long in the deep waters, that he might learn, in his own experience, the wiles of the adversary, and the workings of a tempted, diseased soul, that so he might the

better know how to prescribe for others. Certain it is, that he could never have written some parts of his *Pilgrim's Progress*, and his *Holy War*, had it not been for the lessons which he had learned in adversity, and for the long and distressing trials through which he had himself passed.

In 1653, Mr. Bunyan joined the Baptist church in Bedford, then under the pastoral care of Rev. Mr. Gifford; and in two years more, he was called by the same church to the important work of preaching the gospel. Though still subject to painful spiritual trials and conflicts, he obeyed at once the call of the church, and commenced preaching, as he was able, the unsearchable riches of Christ. He exercised his ministry in various places, with increasing popularity and success, supporting himself meanwhile by the labor of his hands, until he was arrested by a magistrate in the year 1660, and cast into prison.

Mr. Bunyan was one of the first of the Dissenting ministers that suffered imprisonment after the restoration of Charles II. He might have been discharged, if he would have given bonds to refrain from preaching; but he would enter into no such engagements. So far from this, he plainly told his persecutors, "If you let me out to-day, I shall preach again to-morrow." His confinement continued during twelve long years; though for a part of the time, through the indulgence of the jailer, he was permitted occasionally to visit his family, and even to engage in his favorite work of preaching.

To Bunyan and his friends, at that period, this must have been a most trying dispensation. And at first view it seems mysterious now, that a young minister, so gifted, so acceptable, so useful, should be torn away from his family and his work, and shut up, for the space of twelve years, in a loathsome prison. But light has long since been shed on this dark dispensation; and it has come to be regarded as an eminent instance, in which God has caused the wrath of man to praise him, and overruled the violence and wickedness of his enemies for a greater good. Had not Bunyan been imprisoned, it is not at all likely he would have found leisure to write his *Pilgrim's Progress*, and several of his more important tracts; and had these not been written, his fame and his usefulness must have been incomparably diminished. His enemies thought evil against him, but God meant it for

good. They designed to put an end to his usefulness in the kingdom of Christ ; but God made their oppression and persecution the means of increasing his usefulness, perhaps a hundred fold. So true is it that "all things work together for *good* to them that love God," and for the disappointment and ruin of those who oppose him, and persecute his people.

In the year 1672, Mr. Bunyan was liberated, and became the pastor of the Baptist church in Bedford ; in which situation he continued till his death. He used to go up to London once a year, where he preached to very large auditories, amounting, in some instances, to several thousands. Among his hearers on these occasions, was found, frequently, the great Dr. Owen ; and when Charles II once asked the doctor how he, being so learned, could sit and hear such an illiterate tinker, he replied, "May it please your majesty, could I possess the tinker's abilities for preaching, I would gladly relinquish all my learning."

Mr. Bunyan died triumphantly in 1688, sixteen years after his release from prison, and in the sixty-first year of his age. He was buried in Bunhill-fields, a quiet and retired enclosure in the suburbs of London. He wrote no less than sixty different works, several of which have been published in so many forms and languages, that it would be vain to attempt to enumerate them. His *Pilgrim's Progress* is said to have gone through more editions than any other book, except the Bible.

Among the most popular and useful of his publications (next to the *Pilgrim's Progress*), is his *Holy War*, which was written in 1682, ten years after his release from prison. It is of this work, particularly, that we propose to give some account in the following pages.

The *Holy War*, like *Pilgrim's Progress*, is an extended allegory. Under the semblance of the revolt, recovery, and deliverance of an important town, are set forth the fall, the recovery, and final redemption of God's people. It is not divided into chapters, which we deem an objection to it, but properly consists of *three parts* ; the first describing the *fall* of the town ; the second, its *recovery* ; and the third, its complete and final *deliverance* from all its enemies. The town itself is significantly called Mansoul ; its builder is Shaddai, which is the Hebrew name for the Almighty ; and its situa-

tion is in a region of the universe directly between two worlds. In the midst of the town, there is an impregnable castle or fortress,—*the heart*; and the walls of the town are so constructed, that they can never be scaled or battered down, but with the consent of the inhabitants. The town is furnished with five gates, representing the five senses; and these, like the walls, can scarcely be forced or thrown open, but by the will of those within.

The most important personages introduced into this allegory, are King Shaddai, his son Immanuel, their Secretary (the Holy Spirit), with the inferior officers of the celestial court, to each of whom is given some appropriate name. There is also the great prince or giant Diabolus, with his officers and legions, all of whom were once the courtiers and servants of the King Shaddai. These were drawn into rebellion, through the pride of their prince, and being driven at once from the presence of Shaddai, are reserved in exile for final judgment and condemnation.

When King Shaddai had built and peopled Mansoul, he stocked it with an abundance of provisions, gave it the most excellent laws, and appointed officers from among the inhabitants,—such as the Lord Mayor Understanding, Mr. Recorder Conscience, my Lord Willbewill, Captain Resistance, and many others,—who were to administer the government, during the residence of the monarch, with his court, at the royal palace.

Diabolus and his legions, having been banished, for their rebellion, from the court of Shaddai, commenced “roving and ranging from place to place, if perhaps they might find something that was the king’s, by the spoiling of which they might be revenged.” At length they discovered the town of Mansoul; upon which “they shouted horribly for joy, and roared on it as a lion upon his prey, saying, ‘Now we have found the prize, and how to be revenged on King Shaddai, for what he hath done to us.’” Immediately they called a council, and concerted a plan for the capture of Mansoul. Knowing the impossibility of taking the place by storm, since no one could break down the walls or force the gates, but by the consent of those within, they determined to attempt its capture by deception and stealth. Diabolus, attended by two of his trusty servants, and clad in a false armor, which concealed, in great measure, his real character, approached

one of the principal gates of the town, called Ear-gate, and blew his trumpet, that he might have audience. Whereupon some of "the chief of the town of Mansoul, such as my Lord Innocent, my Lord Willbewill, the Lord Mayor, Mr. Recorder, and Captain Resistance, came down to the wall, to see who was there, and what was the matter. And when my Lord Willbewill had looked over, and saw who stood at the gate, he demanded what he was, wherefore he was come, and why he roused the town of Mansoul with so unusual a sound."

Diabolus then began his oration, in which he professed much friendship for the Mansouliaus, and a great concern for their good. He had come, not for his own advantage, but theirs;—come to show them how they might obtain deliverance from a state of bondage into which, unawares, they had fallen. "At this the Mansouliaus began to prick up their ears, and to say, *What is it? Pray, what is it?*" Diabolus proceeded to insinuate, that the laws under which they were placed were both intricate and unreasonable—that Shaddai had imposed them for their trial merely, without any serious intention of executing them—that the things prohibited were of the greatest advantage to them to make them wise—and that it was degrading to so noble a town to submit to such unworthy restrictions.

When Diabolus had done speaking, one of his servants, an old villain, whose name was Ill-pause, took up the matter, and pleaded in much the same strain as his master. He urged his master's great kindness to Mansoul, the manifest truth of what he had said, and how important it was for the inhabitants to *pause* and *consider*, before they rejected such excellent counsel.

The name given to this second speaker (Ill-pause) indicates the extreme danger of stopping to parley with temptation. This was the ruin of the Mansouliaus. They should not have listened to Diabolus a moment. They should not have consented to take his words into consideration at all. And the fact that they *did* pause and take them into consideration, is sufficient to account for all that followed.

While Diabolus was speaking, his other servant, who stood behind him, shot an invisible arrow at Captain Resistance, as he looked over the wall, by which he was wounded and fell down dead,—the Mansouliaus not knowing the cause of

the disaster. And while Ill-pause was speaking, my Lord Innocent, also, gave up the ghost, whether from the shot of an arrow, or from some other cause, has not been ascertained.

These noble Mansouliaus being dead, the remaining inhabitants presently lost all courage and power of resistance. They began to take unwonted liberties, and to disregard the prohibitions of their King; and in their madness, they soon opened their gates,—Eye-gate, Ear-gate, and all the rest,—and received Diabolus and his train into the midst of the city.

Diabolus, being admitted, speedily revolutionized the whole place. He procured himself to be proclaimed king, in place of Shaddai; took possession of the central castle, the heart; turned out all those officers who would not come readily into his service; and gave their places to some of his own followers. His treatment of the Lord Mayor Understanding, and Mr. Recorder Conscience, was very peculiar. The former, “he *darkened*, not only by taking from him his office and power, but by building a high and strong wall just between the sun’s reflections and the windows of his palace, by which means the whole of his habitation was made as dark as darkness itself. And thus, being shut out from the light, he became as one that was born blind. To this his house the Lord Mayor was confined, as to a prison, nor was he permitted, on any account, to go beyond his bounds.”

The ex-Recorder, Conscience, Diabolus is said to have feared more than any of the inhabitants that he found in Mansoul. For he “was a man of courage and faithfulness, to speak the truth on every occasion. And he had a tongue as bravely hung, as he had a head filled with judgment.” He would at times speak out, and his words “were like the rattling thunder.” He made “the whole town shake with his voice.” Because Diabolus could think of nothing else to do with him, he “studied by all means to debauch the old gentleman, and by debauchery to harden his heart;” and this he, in some measure, accomplished. Still farther to destroy his influence, he gave out that the ex-Recorder was mad; in proof of which he urged his phrenzies and inconsistencies. “He doth not always use the same language; but, as all mad-men have their fits, in which they rave, and talk incoherently, even so hath this doating old gentleman his.”

My Lord Willbewill succeeded better with the new government than any of the old officers of the town. It was by his consent that Diabolus was admitted within the gates; and when admitted, he readily took the prescribed oath to serve him. Wherefore, the tyrant restored him to all his former titles and honors. He "made him captain of the castle, governor of the wall, and keeper of the gates of Mansoul." Indeed, it was prescribed in his commission that, without him nothing should be done in all the town; so that in point of authority he was inferior only to Diabolus himself. And "there was none like him to trumpet about the town the brave nature, the wise conduct, and great glory of the king Diabolus. He would range and rove through all the streets, to cry up his illustrious lord, and in all ill courses would do mischief without commandment."

When Diabolus "had thus engarrisoned himself in the town of Mansoul, and had put down and set up whom he thought good, he tore down the golden image of Shaddai, which was upon the castle door, and set up his own vile image in its place. He also changed entirely the laws and customs of the town, and published laws of his own enactment. In short, he effected a complete revolution, changing the whole character and appearance of the place, and strengthening himself in his new position by all the means in his power.

But while these things were transacting in Mansoul, the news of its capture and defection was carried to the palace of the great king Shaddai, and of his son Immanuel. Much as they grieved at what had been done, it seems they were not surprised at it. They had before anticipated that thus it should be. They had even formed a plan, and entered into a covenant,—when the defection of Mansoul should take place,—for its *recovery* and *redemption*. And, through the agency of their Secretary (the Holy Spirit), they caused this covenant now to be published.

The publication of it caused joy unspeakable among all the noble princes and servants of the palace. They proclaimed the glad tidings one to another, and made it ring through all the court: "Mansoul is to be recovered! Mansoul is to be recovered!" But when the publication came to the ears of Diabolus, it filled his infernal heart with perplexity and fear. He immediately confers with my Lord

Willbewill, and "gives him strict charge and command that he should keep watch, by day and by night, at all the gates of the town, especially, Eye-gate and Ear-gate;" and that he should closely examine all those who came into the town for the purpose of trade, lest by any means spies should be admitted. He exacts a new and horrible oath of the inhabitants, that they will never desert him or betray him; and labors to impress on them that their former king will show them no mercy; that if they fall into his hands their case will be desperate; that "blood and nothing but blood is in every blast of Shaddai's trumpet against poor Mansoul." Wherefore, says he, "up and stand to your arms, while you have leisure, that I may teach you some feats of war. Armor I have sufficient for you all, nor can you be hurt by any force, if you keep it well girt and fastened about you. Come, therefore, to my castle, and harness yourselves for the war."

It may interest us to hear king Diabolus's own account of the nature and uses of some parts of his armor:

"My helmet," says he, "*is the hope of doing well at last, what lives soever you live.* A piece of approved armor this; and whoever has it, and *can hold it*, so long no arrow, dart, or sword can hurt him.

"My breastplate is a *hard heart*, as hard as iron itself. I had it forged in my own country, and all my soldiers are armed therewith. If you get and keep this, neither mercy shall win you, nor judgment fright you. This, therefore, is a most necessary piece of armor for all who hate Shaddai, and would fight against him under my banner.

"My shield is *unbelief*; or calling in question the truth of what Shaddai hath said. By all means take this shield. Many attempts have been made upon it, and sometimes, it is true, it hath been bruised; but they that have writ of the wars of Immanuel against my servants, have testified, that *he could do no mighty works, where there was unbelief.* Now, to handle this weapon of mine aright, is not to believe things, because they are true, and because Immanuel asserts them. If he speaks of judgment, care not for it; if he speaks of mercy, care not for it. If he promises and swears that he will do good to Mansoul, if it turns to him; regard not what is said, question the truth of all; for this is to wield the shield of unbelief aright."

Diabolus, having thus armed his vassals, and doubled his guards at the gates of the town, betakes himself to his castle, which was his strong hold. Meanwhile, king Shaddai is preparing to send an army to recover Mansoul; but he prefers not to send, in the first instance, by the hand of his son, but by several of his trusty captains. "The name of the first was Boanerges; the name of the second was Captain Conviction; the name of the third, Captain Judgment; and

the name of the fourth, Captain Execution." To each of these brave captains, the king gave an appropriate ensign and commission, and sent them away with forty thousand chosen men, to effect (peaceably or by force, as the case might be) the recovery of the town of Mansoul. After travelling many days, they at length arrived at the town, and marching up to it, "sat down before Ear-gate; for that was the place of hearing."

When the forces had rested a day or two, Captain Boanerges commanded his trumpeter to approach close to the gate, and summon Mansoul to give audience to the message which he, in his Master's name, was commanded to deliver them. And this the trumpeter did, once and again, but there was none that regarded or returned answer; for so Diabolus had commanded. Thus obstinately do sinners refuse to *hear* or *regard* the solemn warnings of the gospel.

After sounding the third time, the trumpeter obtained an interview with Lord Willbewill over the wall; but received no answer from him that was at all decisive or satisfactory. After this, the four great captains, each in his turn, addressed the Mansouliaus, displaying their terrible ensigns, warning them of the consequences of continued rebellion, and calling upon them to open their gates and submit; but they were answered only by reproaches and threats. Said the new Lord Mayor under Diabolus, whose name was Incredulity:

"We dread you not; we fear you not; nor will we obey your summons. Our gates we keep shut upon you; from our place we will exclude you. Nor will we long suffer you thus to sit down before us. Our people must live in quiet; your presence doth disturb them. Wherefore, arise with bag and baggage and be gone, or we will let fly from the walls against you."

It was at this time that Lord Willbewill stationed a new keeper at Ear-gate—one Mr. Prejudice; and under him sixty men, who were so deaf that they could hear nothing that was said without, by the captains or the soldiers. *Prejudiced ears*, it is well known, are an effectual hindrance against hearing and receiving the messages of the gospel.

The Mansouliaus having utterly refused to open their gates and submit to their former king, nothing now remained to his captains but to give them battle; and this they did with the utmost bravery. The contest, too, was courageously carried on by the soldiers within the town; so that at the end of summer, nothing decisive had been gained by the assailants;

and the best that the captains could do was to make good their retreat, and go into winter quarters.

In the course of the struggle, several men had been lost on either side. The besiegers had slain "Mr. Swearing, Mr. Lewd, Mr. Fury, Mr. Stand-to-Lies, Mr. Drunkenness, and Mr. Cheating." Sinners, under the strivings of the word and spirit of God, commonly abandon their former vices.

The Diabolians, within the town, had also captured three men from the ranks of the assailants, and had persuaded them to enlist in their own body. The history of these three "turn-coats" is too full of instruction to be omitted. They did not belong to the original army of the four captains; but were enlisted by them, while on the road from the king's palace to the town of Mansoul. "Their names were Mr. Tradition, Mr. Human-Wisdom, and Mr. Man's-Invention." In one of the skirmishes before the town, these three men were taken prisoners, and carried within the walls. When they had been in durance awhile, Diabolus sent for them, and communed with them, and presently "asked them if they would be willing to serve him against their former captains. They told him, in reply, that they did not so much live by religion, as by the fates of fortune; and that since his lordship was willing to employ them, they should be willing to serve him. So they enlisted into the company of Captain Anything, where, in a short time, they were all of them promoted. It is of little service to a good cause, to engage the assistance of these three men. They can turn any way, and fight equally well on any side. "They live," as they tell us, "not so much by religion, as by the fates of fortune."

I have said already, that the four captains had retreated, and gone into winter quarters. Their tents, however, were at no great distance from the town, so that they kept it in a state of constant terror and alarm. In the dead of night, often, the trumpets would sound, and the besieging soldiers would be heard about the walls, shouting and lifting up their voices for battle. Provisions also became short in Mansoul, and the old Recorder, Mr. Conscience, began to arouse himself, and to speak as in a voice of thunder.

In these circumstances, the four captains thought it might be well to send out their trumpeter, and summon the town anew to surrender. And this they did at three several

times, making the message more and more terrific, at each successive summons. At length the besieged, in their distress and fear, sent Lord Willbewill up to Ear-gate, with a proposition to surrender upon *certain conditions*,—particularly that the present governors of the town should not, upon a change of masters, be displaced. Sinners are easily brought to submit to God, *if they can be permitted to make their own conditions*.

The terms proposed in this instance were, of course, rejected by the besieging captains; and the Mansouliaus were told plainly, that if they would hope to be forgiven, they must submit *without reserve*, trusting to their offended sovereign "to make such terms with them and for them as should seem good in his eyes." At this declaration, the new Lord Mayor Incredulity was much displeased, and made one of his lying speeches to the people, which put an end to all further negotiations for peace.

Still, the town was in great distress, and the inhabitants began to be divided among themselves; a part siding with the old Lord Mayor and Recorder (Understanding and Conscience), and a part with the Diabolian magistrates. After much disputing between the parties, "they passed at length from words to blows; and now," as our author informs us, "there were knocks on both sides. The good old gentleman, Mr. Conscience, was knocked down twice, by one of the Diabolians whose name was Benumbing;" and my Lord Understanding was in imminent danger of being slain. On the other side, one Rashhead, a Diabolian, had his brains beaten out; and Mr. Prejudice, the gate-keeper, was tumbled into the dirt. Capt. Anything, also, "had one of his legs broken, and he that did it wished it had been his neck." To appease the uproar, Diabolus interposed, and threw my Lord Understanding and Mr. Conscience into prison, where they lay for a time, and were hardly used.

While these things were transacting within the town, the captains without agreed to send a *petition* to the court of Shaddai, praying for more help. In a warfare of this nature, fighting and praying must go together. When their petition had been brought to the palace of the King, it was delivered into the hands of his Son.

"So he took it and read it, and because the contents of it pleased him well, he mended, and also in some things added to the petition

himself. So, after he had made such amendments and additions as he thought convenient with his own hand, he carried it to the King; to whom, when he had with obeisance delivered it, he put on authority, and spake to it himself."

We have here a beautiful illustration of the manner of our Saviour's intercession. He takes our poor prayers, perfects them with his own hand, and perfumes them with the incense of his intercession; and so they are accepted with the Father.

In answer to the humble petition of his servants, King Shaddai resolves to send his son Immanuel, for the capture of Mansoul, and with him five more mighty captains, and a great army. The names of the captains now to be commissioned were "Capt. Credence, Capt. Good-Hope, Capt. Charity, Capt. Innocent, and Capt. Patience." Immanuel also took with him "fifty-four battering-rams, and twelve slings to whirl stones withal,"—representing the sixty-six books of the Bible.

When this mighty army had arrived at Mansoul, and joined the forces which were already there, they "beset the city behind and before, and environed it round on every side;" they also raised mounts and set up their engines of war against it; so that "whichever way the inhabitants looked, they saw force and power lie in siege against them." Still they were not disposed to open their gates, or so much as listen to any proposals which Immanuel held out to them. He first set up his white flag on mount Gracious, in token of his readiness to show them mercy; and then his fiery red flag on mount Justice, in token of the revenge with which they were threatened. He made a proclamation to the town, in which he asserted his right to the place, and his determination to recover it; charging home upon the inhabitants their guilt in rejecting him, and earnestly inviting them to return. But all this while both Eye-gate and Ear-gate were closely barred, so that naught which he did or said could be seen or heard within the town.

It does not consist with our plan to describe all the glorious feats of war performed by Immanuel and his forces, while lying before the town of Mansoul. Suffice it to say, that Diabolus was so terrified and straitened, that he sent to him at two different times, to propose conditions of peace. In the first instance, he made eight distinct propositions, diminishing his claims time after time, till at length he asked the *very*

least that he could ask, and yet have any remaining rights in Mansoul, either for himself or his friends ; but all his propositions were indignantly rejected. It is hard for the struggling sinner to *give up all*. And yet, until he does come to this point, he need not hope to be accepted.

In the next instance, Diabolus proposed,—as it was the object of Immanuel to *reclaim* Mansoul,—to become his assistant in this work of reformation.

“I will show the people wherein they have erred, and that transgression stands in the way to life. I will show them the holy law to which they must conform, even that which they have broken. I will press upon them the necessity of a reformation, according to law. And besides, I myself, at my own proper cost and charge, will set up and maintain a sufficient ministry, besides lecturers, in Mansoul.”

The Devil has still his ministry and lecturers in the world. He is not unwilling to turn reformer, or even revival preacher, when his ends can in that way be best promoted. But Immanuel *needed* none of his assistance in recovering Mansoul, and he *would have none*. “I will possess it myself,” said he. “I will dispossess and cast thee out. I will set up mine own standard in the midst of the people. I will govern them by new laws, new officers, new motives, and new ways.”

Shortly after the failure of this negotiation, the decisive battle was fought, in which Ear-gate was broken open ; the forces of Immanuel were introduced into the town ; and Diabolus was driven to take refuge in his strong hold (the heart).

When the captains, Boanerges, Conviction and Judgment had gained admittance, they first took possession of the palace of the Ex-Recorder, Conscience,—at which the old gentleman was greatly terrified, and began to thunder forth death and destruction in the ears of all who approached him. The house of my Lord Understanding was also taken ; and my Lord Willbewill was hotly pursued, and his Diabolian servants were all slaughtered before his eyes. These three gentlemen, the former governors of the town, were immediately imprisoned, to await the orders of Prince Immanuel.

Meanwhile, the gate of the castle was terribly assailed by the victorious captains, and in a little time was broken down. And then did they send for Prince Immanuel himself, to come and bind the old traitor Diabolus, and lead him in triumph at his chariot wheels through the streets of the town ;

all which was done in a manner most glorious to the Prince, and most humiliating and mortifying to his grand enemy. Having thus subdued and humbled him before the inhabitants, Immanuel dragged him forth without the gates, and sent him away into "a parched desert, in a salt land, seeking rest but finding none."

The inhabitants of the town were now in the utmost distress and anxiety. They were entirely in the hands of him against whom they had most wickedly revolted; and whether he was intending to kill them or spare them alive, to save or destroy them, they could not tell. They sent petition after petition to his royal pavilion, confessing their sins and imploring mercy; but as yet they received no favorable answer. Christ often tries the patience of those whom he has, in a manner, subdued, and intends to save. He will try them, at least, till he has effectually humbled them, and brought them in unreserved submission to his feet.

At length a petition was drawn up in the following terms,—terms more befitting their condition than any they had before used:

"Prince Immanuel the great, Lord of all worlds, and Master of mercy, we, thy poor, wretched, miserable, dying town of Mansoul, do confess unto thy great and glorious Majesty, that we have sinned against thy Father and thee, and are no more worthy to be called thy Mansoul, but rather to be cast into the pit. If thou wilt slay us, we have deserved it. If thou wilt condemn us to the deep, we cannot but say thou art righteous. We cannot complain whatever thou dost, or however thou carriest it towards us. But O, let mercy reign, and let it be extended to us! O, let mercy take hold upon us, and free us from our transgressions, and we will sing of thy mercy and of thy judgment. Amen."

When this humble petition had been prepared, there was a question among the inhabitants by whom they should send it. Some were for sending it by an old man of the town whose name was Good-Deed; but Mr. Recorder Conscience was opposed to this.

"'For,' said he, 'we now stand in need of, and are pleading for mercy: wherefore, to send our petition by a man of this name, will seem to cross the petition itself. Should we make Mr. Good-Deed our messenger, when our petition cries for mercy?'"

"'Besides,' quoth the old gentleman, 'should the Prince now, as he receives the petition, ask him, and say, 'What is thy name?' as nobody knows but he will; and he should say, 'Old Good-Deed,' what, think you, would Immanuel say but this? 'Ay! is old Good-Deed yet alive in Mansoul? then let old Good-Deed save you from your distresses.' And if he says so, I am sure we are lost; nor can a thousand of old Good-Deeds save Mansoul.'"

Dissuaded by this reasoning against employing Good-Deed, it was finally concluded to send the petition by two of the inhabitants, whose names were Mr. Desires-awake and Mr. Wet-Eyes. These men, therefore, carried the petition to the Prince, and obtained audience. *Christ never refuses petitions such as this.* Immanuel had a long and close conversation with the messengers, at the close of which he promised to consider their prayer, and so to answer it as would be most for his own glory. He also gave orders that the state prisoners, the Lords Understanding and Willbewill, and Mr. Recorder Conscience, should be brought out to him into his camp on the morrow.

At the time appointed, the prisoners were led forth, with ropes on their heads, to meet the Prince; when the following conversation took place between them:

"'Are you the men,' said he, 'that heretofore were the servants of Shaddai?' And they said, 'Yes, Lord, yes.' Then said the Prince again, 'Are you the men that did suffer yourselves to be corrupted and defiled by that abominable one, Diabolus?' And they said, 'We did more than suffer it, Lord; for we chose it of our own mind.' The Prince asked further, saying, 'Could you have been content that your slavery should have continued under his tyranny as long as you had lived?' Then, said the prisoners, 'Yes, Lord, yes; for his ways were pleasing to our flesh, and we were grown aliens to a better state.' 'And did you,' said he, 'when I came up against this town of Mansoul, heartily wish that I might not have the victory over you?' 'Yes, Lord, yes,' said they. Then said the Prince, 'And what punishment is it, think you, that you deserve at my hand, for these and other your high and mighty sins?' And they said, 'Both death and the deep, Lord; for we have deserved no less.' He asked again, if they had aught to say for themselves why the sentence, that they confessed they had deserved, should not be passed upon them? And they said, 'We can say nothing, Lord: thou art just, for we have sinned.' Then said the Prince, 'And for what are those ropes on your heads?' The prisoners answered, 'These ropes are to bind us withal to the place of execution, if mercy be not pleasing in thy sight.' So he further asked, if all the men in the town of Mansoul were in this confession, as they? And they answered, 'All the natives, Lord; but for the Diabolonians that came into our town when the tyrant got possession of us, we can say nothing for them.'

"Then the Prince commanded that a herald should be called, and that he should, in the midst and throughout the camp of Immanuel, proclaim, and that with sound of trumpet, that the Prince, the Son of Shaddai, had, in his Father's name, and for his Father's glory, gotten a perfect conquest and victory over Mansoul; and that the prisoners should follow him, and say, Amen. So, this was done as he had commanded. And presently the music that was in the upper region sounded melodiously, the captains that were in the camp shouted, and the soldiers did sing songs of triumph to the Prince; the colors waved in

the wind, and great joy was every where, only it was wanting as yet in the hearts of the men of Mansoul.

"Then the Prince called for the prisoners, to come and to stand again before him, and they came and stood trembling. And he said unto them, 'The sins, trespasses, iniquities, that you, with the whole town of Mansoul, have from time to time committed against my Father and me, I have power and commandment from my Father, to forgive to the town of Mansoul, and do forgive you accordingly.' And having so said, he gave them, written in parchment, and sealed with seven seals, a large and general pardon, commanding my Lord Mayor, my Lord Willbewill, and Mr. Recorder, to proclaim and cause it to be proclaimed to-morrow, by that the sun is up, throughout the whole town of Mansoul.

"Moreover, the Prince stripped the prisoners of their mourning weeds, and gave them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

He also took away their ropes, and brake in pieces their fetters, and put chains of gold about their necks, and bracelets on their arms, and commanded Captain Credence to escort them back to the town, and see that the pardon which had been signed and sealed should be proclaimed on the morrow to all the inhabitants.

It will be readily conceived, that this sudden and glorious change in the condition and prospects of the Mansouliaus, must have filled them with unutterable joy. The three prisoners almost fainted under it. My Lord Willbewill, in particular, swooned quite away. And when the tidings were carried to the town, the inhabitants shouted, so that the earth rang again; nor could they forbear weeping and leaping for joy. They exulted, and sang, and rang their bells, and music sounded in every house, so that those "which dwelt in the highest orbs were constrained to open their windows, and put out their heads," and join in the chorus which went up from beneath them. Such are the peace and the joy of pardoned sin;—a peace "that passeth all understanding,"—a "joy unspeakable and full of glory." "There is joy among the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."

At the earnest solicitation of the inhabitants, Immanuel consented to march, with all his forces, into the town, and to take up his abode in its strong castle (the heart). And he not only came in to the Mansouliaus in this way, but he supped with them, and permitted them to sup with him, and set before them such entertainment as earth does not yield,—rarities prepared and brought down to them from his Father's court; on which account, the late miserable people were

"transported with joy, while they saw and considered what their blessed Immanuel entertained them with, and what mysteries he opened to their view. And when they were at home, and in their most retired places, they could not but sing of their Prince Immanuel."

When these first rejoicings were over, the Prince proceeded to re-organize the town, and to purge it of the remains of its former abominations. He appointed the Lords Understanding and Willbewill to their former offices, and made Mr. Knowledge Recorder in place of Conscience; reserving the latter for a more honorable station, to be conferred on him afterwards. He demolished the towers which Diabolus had built; erected others at such points as he deemed necessary; and planted his engines of war within the town, for its defence. He tore down the image of Diabolus from the castle gate, destroying it utterly, and beating it to powder; after which, he set up his own and his Father's image in its place. He next proceeded to the trial and execution of the principal Diabolians that were taken within the town; as "Mr. Atheism, Mr. Hard-Heart, Mr. False-Peace, Mr. No-Truth, Mr. Pitiless, Mr. Haughty, and the like." This was a matter of no little difficulty, and that for two reasons: First, it was the practice of these Diabolians to conceal themselves under *false* or *assumed names*. For example, Mr. Covetousness would take the name of Good-Husbandry; Mr. Pride, of Neatness; and Mr. Indifference-to-Truth, of Charity. And secondly, when these men had been tried and sentenced, it was *hard to destroy them*;—so hard, that had not the Great Secretary of king Shaddai (the Holy Spirit) come to the help of the Mansouliaus, their enemies would have escaped, even from the place of execution. The Diabolian Mayor, Incredulity, was tried and sentenced with the rest; but he contrived to break prison, and get out of the city; after which, he roamed about till he found Diabolus, to whom he narrated all the changes which had taken place.

"When Diabolus had heard this lamentable story, he yelled, and snuffed up the wind like a dragon, and made the sky to look dark with his roaring; he also swore that he would try to be revenged on Mansoul for this. So they, both he and his old friend Incredulity, concluded to enter into great consultation, how they might get the town of Mansoul again."

Having destroyed such of the Diabolians as could then be taken, Immanuel commissioned a new captain from among

the people, whose name was Experience. Also he renewed and enlarged their charter, annexing such provisions and privileges as their new and altered circumstances seemed to require. And that nothing might be wanting to their safety and happiness, he proceeded to establish a *Ministry* for them, which might instruct them in the things that concerned their present and future state. For Prime Minister—one to whom all others were to be subject, and to whom above all others they were to take heed—he gave them the Lord Chief Secretary of his Father's house (the Holy Spirit). But “in all terrene and domestic matters,”—the laws, judgments and statutes of the town,—the old Recorder Conscience was constituted minister; with the express proviso, however, that he “must not presume to be a revealer or judge of those high and supernatural mysteries that are kept close in the bosom of the Father; for those things knows no man, nor can any reveal them, but the Secretary only.”

Prince Immanuel was faithful to warn his people, that there were Diabolians yet concealed among them, who would study, plot and contrive their destruction; and who, the better to compass their designs, might in some instances “seem rife and hot for religion. Nor can you,” says he, “utterly rid yourselves of them, unless you should *pull down the walls of your town*, the which I am by no means willing you should do. But you must be diligent, and quit you like men. You must observe their holds, find out their haunts, assault them, and make no peace with them.” Good Mr. Bunyan, it seems, was no Perfectionist.

In addition to all the other privileges and honors which Immanuel conferred on the inhabitants of Mansoul, he, on a day appointed, gave them a *badge*, that should distinguish them from all other people, and by which all men might know that they were his. He arrayed them in *white robes*, which he had provided for them, which they were expected to wear daily, and to preserve white and clean. “For if they be soiled,” said he, “it is a dishonor to me; and if you walk without them, men will see your shame.”

And now did the Prince have frequent and intimate communion with his people. “Scarcely a week passed but a banquet must be had betwixt him and them; nor did he send them away from his banqueting house empty; but they must have a ring, a gold chain, a bracelet, a white stone,” or some

other token of his favor and love." And "now did their cup of consolation run over. They ate of the finest of the wheat, and drank milk and honey out of the rock." They pursued their necessary *business* joyfully. "They would sing and work, and work and sing, from morning till night, so that quite through the town of Mansoul, nothing was to be found but harmony, quietness, joy, and health."

But it was at this *very point*, where they least expected it, and were least prepared for it, that a secret enemy assailed them, and inflicted upon them a dreadful injury. There was in the town a man of Diabolian descent, whose name was Carnal-Security. He was a dauntless, conceited busy-body, who was always prating, and on all occasions was sure to be found on the strongest side. He valiantly served Diabolus, so long as his party prevailed; but when he saw him effectually routed, and the town revolutionized, he "slyly wheeled about," and was as busy and as noisy on the other side. The manner of his proceeding is thus detailed by our author :

"He beginneth his tale with the power and strength of Mansoul, and affirmed that it was impregnable; now magnifying their captains, and their slings, and their rams; then crying up their fortifications and strongholds; and, lastly, the assurances that they had from their Prince, that Mansoul should be happy for ever. But when he saw that some of the men of the town were tickled and taken with his discourse, he makes it his business; and walking from street to street, house to house, and man to man, he at last brought Mansoul to dance after his pipe, and to grow almost as carnally secure as himself; so from talking, they went to feasting, and from feasting to sporting; and so to some other matters."

In this way Mr. Carnal-Security beguiled, not merely the common people, but the principal men of the town, such as the Lord Mayor, the Lord Willbewill, and the Recorder.

When Immanuel, who was still in the town, perceived the course that things were taking, he bemoaned them in private with the Secretary, saying, "O that my people had hearkened to me, and that Mansoul had walked in my ways!" And when he found that those for whom he had done so much began to neglect him,—that they visited him less frequently than they formerly did, and seemed less to enjoy his company,—that their intimacy with a stranger and an enemy was increasing, and their love for him was evidently diminishing; he said in his heart, "I will leave this place,

and return to my Father's court, till Mansoul shall consider and acknowledge their offence." And this purpose he speedily put in execution. He became more reserved in his intercourse with the people, saw less of them, and at last retired from the castle and the town, and left them to pursue their own chosen way.

The point to which we have now arrived in the Holy War is full of instruction for the people of God; and more especially for the recent, inexperienced convert. Thousands and thousands of happy converts have been cast down and wounded, in precisely the manner here pointed out. Listening to the wily suggestions of Carnal-Security, they have become lifted up with pride, confident in their own strength, and neglectful of their heavenly Friend; and ere they were aware, he had departed, and they were left. So it was with the Mansouliaus, in this instance. They were so taken with the doctrine of Carnal-Security, that they hardly missed their glorious Immanuel, or knew or felt that he was gone.

But on a certain occasion, their deceiver (as was his custom) had a merry-meeting at his house, to which many of the people of Mansoul were invited; and among the rest, a venerable old gentleman whose name was Godly-Fear. But while the other guests were eating and drinking, this man sat like a stranger in the midst of them, neither tasting nor seeming to enjoy any thing. Whereupon Mr. Carnal-Security accosted him, as follows:

"Mr. Godly-Fear, are you not well? You seem to be ill of body or mind, or both. I have a cordial of Mr. Forget-Good's making, the which, sir, if you will take a dram of, I hope it may make you bonny and blithe, and so make you more fit for us, feasting companions."

"Unto whom the good old gentleman discreetly replied, 'Sir, I thank you for all things courteous and civil; but for your cordial, I have no list thereto. But a word to the natives of Mansoul: You, the elders and chief of Mansoul, to me it is strange to see you so jocund and merry, when the town of Mansoul is in such woful case.'

"Then said Mr. Carnal-Security, 'You want sleep, good sir, I doubt. If you please, lie down and take a nap, and we, meanwhile, will be merry.'

"Then said the good man as follows: 'Sir, if you were not destitute of an honest heart, you could not do as you have done, and do.'

"Then said Mr. Carnal-Security, 'Why?'

"Then Godly-Fear proceeded: 'It is no time to flatter, or be silent. It is you, Mr. Carnal-Security, that have wilily stripped Mansoul, and driven her glory from her; you have pulled down her towers, you have broken down her gates, you have spoiled her locks and bars.'

"And now, to explain myself: From that time that my lords of Mansoul and you, sir, grew so great, from that time, the Strength of Mansoul has been offended, and now he is arisen and is gone. If any shall question the truth of my words, I will answer him by this, and such like questions, 'Where is the Prince Immanuel? When did a man or woman in Mansoul see him? When did you hear from him, or taste any of his dainty bits?' You are now a feasting with this Diabolonian monster, but he is not your Prince. I say, therefore, though enemies from without, had you taken heed, could not have made a prey of you, yet, since you have sinned against your Prince, your enemies within have been too hard for you."

Upon this, old Mr. Conscience started as from a slumber, and began to reproach himself and his companions, affirming that the assertions of Mr. Godly-Fear were true. The guests, also, were greatly alarmed; and, rising up in haste, they seized Carnal-Security, and burned him and his house with fire. They next began to look for their Prince; but though they sought him, they found him not. In their distress, they ran to the Lord Secretary, to see if he could inform them respecting Immanuel; but "he would not admit them to a conference about the matter, nor show them his face, nor give them any intelligence."

"And now was it a day of clouds and thick darkness to the Mansouliaus. Now they began to perceive what the company and prattle of Mr. Carnal-Security had done, and into what a desperate condition his swaggering words had brought them.

"When the Sabbath was come, they went to hear their subordinate preacher (Conscience); but, O! how did he thunder and lighten that day! His text was in Jonah 2: 8; *They that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy.* But there was such power and authority in the sermon, and such a dejection seen in the countenances of the people, that the like hath seldom been known or heard of.

"About this time, also, there was a great sickness in the town of Mansoul, and not only the inhabitants, but the captains and men of war were sorely afflicted. The garments, too, which Immanuel had given them were in a sorry case. Some were rent, others were soiled, and some did hang so loosely upon them, that the next bush they came at was ready to tear them off."

When they had been a while in this doleful condition, the people, at the instance of Mr. Godly-Fear, concluded to send a petition, by the Lord Mayor, to Prince Immanuel, imploring him "to turn again unto them, and not to keep his anger for ever." But the Lord Mayor could gain no admittance to the Prince, and the only answer he received was, "They have turned unto me their back, and not their face; but in the time of their trouble they say, Arise and save us." When this answer was reported to the men of Mansoul, they

"mourned and wept, and threw ashes and dust upon their heads, and put sackcloth upon their loins, and went crying through the streets of the town; the which when the rest of the people saw, they also mourned and wept."

After a season of desertion and distress, Mr. Godly-Fear advised the people to petition again, and to persevere in doing it: "For," said he, "it is the way of the great Shaddai to make men wait, and exercise patience; and those in need should be willing to stay his leisure." "Then they took courage, and went on petitioning again and again; and this was the work of the miserable inhabitants through all that long and tedious winter." Still, they did not break off all intercourse with the lurking Diabolians, nor humble and reform themselves as they ought; and, consequently, their petitioning was to little purpose.

While Mansoul was in this distressed condition, the Diabolians in the town began to take courage, and to hold meetings, and concluded to send a letter to Diabolus himself, inviting him to come back, and attempt the re-capture of the place. To this invitation a horrible answer was returned from the infernal den. The Diabolians were incited to do all the mischief in their power, and carefully to spy out by what means the inhabitants could most be injured; whether "by persuading them to a vain and loose life; or whether by tempting them to doubt and despair; or whether by blowing them up with the gunpowder of pride and self-conceit."

On the reception of this infernal counsel, the meetings of the Diabolians were multiplied; and they had frequent and deep consultations among themselves as to the best mode of proceeding with their designs of mischief. They tried various experiments, some of which were successful, and others not. Frequent letters, also, passed between them and Diabolus, and long conferences were held on the same subject. At length it was concluded that Diabolus should raise an army of 20,000 Doubters, with which he should come and fight against Mansoul. He seems to have regarded these Doubters as the most effective troops that he could muster. "For," said he, "if we can fill the minds of the Mansouliaus with doubts, and drive them on to desperation, that will knock the nail on the head. As soon as they begin to question the love of their Prince, that will increase his disgust of them; and then they will leave off sending petitions to him, from

which I have more to fear than from any thing else that they can do."

Although these plans were matured, on the part of the Diabolians, with the utmost secrecy and cunning, they were fairly outwitted by one of the inhabitants, whose name was Prywell. He was so fortunate as to discover their place of meeting, and overheard them in their deliberations. He even ventured out to the land of Doubting, and saw the terrible army which Diabolus was mustering, with which to assault the town. This intelligence he communicated at once to the Lord Mayor, and to the other magistrates, by which means they were enabled to take seasonable measures, in a time of such exceeding peril. They set a double guard before all their gates. They made diligent search for the Diabolians in the town, that they might be taken, tried, and executed. They found this, however, a very difficult matter. "For though they could plainly see the prints of their feet, and so follow them by their track and smell to their holds, yet take them, hold them, and bring them to justice, they could not; their ways were so crooked, their holds so strong, and they so quick to take sanctuary there." The magistrates, also, proclaimed a fast in the town, and renewed their petitions to the court of Shaddai for help.

Meanwhile, Diabolus had raised his army, and actually appeared at the gates of the town. He had divided his Doubters into several companies, and placed them under chosen captains. Thus, one company consisted of the Election Doubters; another of the Vocation Doubters; a third of the Grace Doubters; a fourth of the Perseverance Doubters; a fifth of the Resurrection Doubters; and a sixth of the Glory Doubters. He rode at their head, in great terror and power, attended by his hellish captains, as though he would take the city by storm. By the roar of his drums, and the sound of his trumpets, and the display of his horrid, infernal ensigns, he thought, at once, to frighten the inhabitants into submission. But being foiled in this attempt, through the bravery of the captains within the town, and the playing of the warlike engines from the battlements on the walls, his next plan was to compass his design of mischief by flattery. And so, having "besugared his lips, he seemed to be a very sweet-mouthed, peaceable prince," intending no injury, seeking no revenge, but only "the welfare, the good, the advantage of the town and people."

But the magistrates and people knew him too well to be taken by any such pretences. They told him plainly that they had "rather die by his hands, than to fall in with his flattery and lying deceits."

Upon receiving this answer, "the tyrant fell into a hellish rage," and resolved to give battle without further delay. The particulars of this dreadful battle we have not time or space to detail. Suffice it to say that it lasted several days, during which both parties displayed great bravery, and both experienced alternate success and repulse; till, at length, Diabolus succeeded in forcing Feel-Gate, and came with his army into the town. The captains and men of war retreated to the central castle (the heart), of which their grand enemy tried all methods, whether of force or favor, to get possession, but in vain. Still, he was in the town; and there he remained, plundering, distressing, and murdering the inhabitants, for many days. "And now did Mansoul seem to be nothing but a place of darkness, a den of dragons, an emblem of hell. It lay almost a barren wilderness, with nothing but thorns, briars, weeds, and nettles upon the face of it."

After the town had been in this lamentable condition for a long time,—until its very "wickedness had corrected it, and its backslidings reproved it,"—the elders and magistrates came together, and agreed to send yet another petition to Immanuel for help. But Mr. Godly-Fear admonished them, that they must get the Lord Secretary's hand to their paper, or they would not prevail. Accordingly, in their distress, they went to the Secretary, and humbly entreated his assistance.

"Well, said the Secretary, I will draw up a petition for you, and will also set my hand to it. But yourselves must be present at the doing of it, and your desires must go into it. True, the hand and pen shall be mine, but the petition must be yours. I have no need to petition for myself, for I have not offended."

So a petition was drawn up, in the manner proposed, and sent by Captain Credence to the court of Immanuel. It was graciously received, as might have been expected, and an answer of mercy was returned. The Prince commended the perseverance and faithfulness of the Lord Mayor, the Lord Willbewill, Mr. Conscience, and more especially of Mr. Godly-Fear, and promised that they should not lose their reward. He also assured the people generally, that he had

not disregarded their petitions, although he had not immediately answered them ; that he approved of their steadfastness under afflictions, and the state of mind into which they had come ; that for the present, they must obey the Lord Secretary and Captain Credence ; and that all should be well with them in the end.

When Diabolus heard that the people had forwarded another petition to Immanuel, and had received a favorable answer, he was in a great rage, and swore to be revenged on them for their audacity. He perpetrated new acts of cruelty upon the defenceless inhabitants, and made new and more vigorous efforts to get possession of the castle, but in vain. He next called a council of war, the result of which was, that he should withdraw his forces, for a season, from the town, and endeavor, meanwhile, to get into the castle, and ruin the inhabitants, by *covertly* drawing them into sin.

This plan was no sooner adopted, than it went into effect ; —and it was while the army of Diabolus lay before the town, waiting an opportunity to seduce and ruin it, that Prince Immanuel appeared, and the decisive battle was fought, which resulted in the flight of Diabolus and his hellish lords, and in the utter destruction of his whole army. “There was not left so much as one Doubter alive, but their dead bodies lay spread as dung upon the ground.”

When the battle was over, the Prince, being “welcomed with a thousand welcomes” by the grateful inhabitants, made a public and glorious entry into Mansoul. All the way, his ear was greeted with music, and his path strewn with garlands. The castle gates were thrown wide open to him, and he was entreated to take possession, with all his train, of those royal apartments which had been made ready for his reception. The people were then directed to wash their garments, and put on their ornaments, and present themselves before him for his blessing. “So there was music and rejoicing throughout the whole town of Mansoul. The bells, also, did ring, and the sun shone comfortably upon them for a great while together.”

But Diabolus could not be satisfied to give up Mansoul, without another struggle. When he and his companions had escaped to their den, they directly summoned a council of war, and resolved to raise another army, if possible to overcome and destroy the town. This second army was to

consist partly of Doubters, but chiefly of Blood-Men,—men “who have their name from the malignity of their nature,”—men whose whole heart is set upon blood. Of the commanders of these men, one was Captain Cain, another Captain Nimrod, another Captain Judas, and another Captain Pope. So Diabolus brought up his army, and again besieged the town, and sent in a terrible summons to the inhabitants to surrender. But they applied at once to their Prince Immanuel, and he undertook for their defence. He sent out an army which destroyed, scattered, and captured the terrible forces of Diabolus, so that they never openly assaulted Mansoul more. Also, the Diabolians within the town were more hotly pursued and hunted than ever, and many of them were taken and put to death. Still, there were a few of the subtlest of them that remained in Mansoul, till the time when the city was taken down, and removed. “But the inhabitants kept them to their dens and holes; or if any of them did appear in the streets, the whole town would be up in arms, the very children crying after them, as they would after a thief, and endeavoring to stone them to death with stones.”

The Holy War concludes with Immanuel's final address to the Mansouliaus, in which he speaks of the great things he had already done for them, and the *greater* things which he was intending to do, in time to come.

“For after a little while,” says he, “I will take down this famous town of Mansoul, stick and stone, to the ground. And I will carry the stones thereof, and the timber thereof, and the walls thereof, and the dust thereof, and the inhabitants thereof, into mine own country, and will there set it up in such strength and glory as it never did see, in the kingdom where it is now placed. I will even there set it up for my Father's habitation, because for that purpose was it first erected, and I will make it a spectacle of wonder, and a monument of mercy.”

The Prince proceeds to charge the Mansouliaus that, in future, they keep more white and clean the robes which he, sometime before, had given them.

“They are in themselves fine linen, but ye must keep them white and clean. This will be your wisdom and honor, and will be greatly for my glory. When your garments are white, the world will count you mine. As I have provided for you an open fountain in which to wash your garments, see to it that ye wash often there, and go not in defiled garments, which will be to my dishonor, and your shame.”

After warning his people against the influence of the few Diabolians that still continued lurking in the city, Immanuel

goes on to inform them why these enemies had been permitted to remain.

"It is to keep you wakening; to try your love; to make you watchful; and to cause you to prize my noble captains, their soldiers, and my mercy. Should I slay all your enemies within, the many that are without would find you sleeping; and then, as in a moment, they would swallow you up. I left you these enemies in you, not to do you *hurt* (the which they will, if you hearken to them and serve them), but to do you *good*—the which they must, if you watch and fight against them. Know, therefore, that whatever they shall tempt you to, my design is that they should drive you, not farther off, but nearer to my Father;—that they should teach you to war, and make petitioning desirable to you, and keep you little in your own eyes. Hearken diligently unto this, O my Mansoul.

"Remember farther, O Mansoul, that for you I have lived; for you I have died, I have reconciled you to my Father by the blood of my cross; and being reconciled, ye shall live through me. I will pray for you; I will fight for you; I will yet do you good. Nothing can hurt you but sin; nothing can grieve me but sin; nothing can make you base before your foes but sin. Above all things, therefore, take heed of sin.

"Behold, I lay upon you none other burden than what thou hast already. Hold fast till I come."

The work here reviewed, though full of interest and instruction, has yet some obvious defects; owing in part, doubtless, to the impossibility of reaching, by means of an allegory, all the important points of the case. For example, almost no notice is taken of the work of *the Spirit*, in the recovery or conversion of Mansoul. The Lord Secretary scarcely appears on the stage at all, except in the third and last part of the work,—that relating to the deliverance of Mansoul (after conversion) from its external and internal enemies.

The work of regeneration is also represented as possessing somewhat of a *progressive* character; or if there be any where a *turning point*, it is not easy to discover where that point is. Diabolus leaves the castle days before Immanuel enters it; and Mansoul makes an unreserved submission some time before pardon is bestowed.

But notwithstanding some slight abatements of this kind, the work conveys, and in a manner deeply to interest and impress the reader, a variety of important lessons. Some of these have been glanced at, as we passed along. Others of a more general nature will now be briefly noticed.

We see here, first of all, *the inestimable worth of the human soul*. It is *Mansoul*, which is the object of such intense solicitude and conflict, between the high powers of heaven and of hell. It was to seduce and possess Mansoul, that all the stores of hellish cunning and malice were put in requisition, in the first instance. It was to recover fallen Mansoul, that the armies of heaven were sent forth to battle, and the great Son of God consented to put himself at their head. It was to re-capture Mansoul, that all hell was moved a second time. And it was to deliver it, when assailed and brought into bondage by the powers of hell, that the great and final conflict was waged and won. What, then, is Mansoul, that it should be the object of such a deep and abiding interest, among all the powers of heaven and of hell;—that for the possession of it, such high personages should be so long engaged,—such terrible battles should be fought,—and such victories gained! Whatever man may think of his own soul, we know how it is estimated by the inhabitants of other worlds. The great things which Christ *has done* for it furnish a strong comment on his most impressive interrogation, “What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?”

We further learn, from this allegory, *the great evil of sin*. It was *sin* which wrought the ruin of Mansoul—which pointed every dart of its great adversary—which inflicted all its wounds and miseries, both before and after its conversion. And it was to recover Mansoul from *sin*—from its terrible curse, and its reigning power—that the whole work of the Saviour was performed. How great, then, the evil of sin! And how important the closing words of Prince Immanuel to Mansoul on this very subject: “Nothing can hurt *you* but sin; nothing can grieve *me* but sin; nothing can make *you* base before your enemies but sin. Above all things, therefore, beware of sin.”

Again, we learn from this allegory, that the warfare against our spiritual enemies, and more especially against sin, is a *long and perilous war*. It is not so soon or so easily terminated as some men dream. The goal of sinless perfection is not reached at a bound. Outward enemies may be much more easily overcome, than inward ones. It was the lurking Diabolians within the town, secluded in their secret haunts, that outlived all the other enemies of Mansoul. Indeed, these could not be wholly exterminated, till Mansoul itself

was taken down, to be removed to another and better state. Happy the Christian, who understands the nature and perils of this warfare, and who girds on his armor and fights to the end!

We learn, finally, from the work over which we have passed, the *goodness*, the *patience*, the *forbearance* of God. The goodness of God was manifested in the first *building* of Mansoul,—in constituting it such a noble and all but impregnable structure. But when it had wickedly revolted from God, and fallen under the power of the Destroyer, a much higher degree of goodness was manifested, in the toils and sacrifices which were endured for its recovery, and in bestowing upon its consciously guilty inhabitants a free and a full pardon. But even now, the manifestations of divine goodness are not complete. When Mansoul is again seduced, and most wickedly wanders from its almighty Deliverer, still, it must not be abandoned. It must be delivered, restored, forgiven, and blessed. It must be crowned with celestial honor, and its cup be made to overflow with joy. It must be kept by the mighty power of God, while it continues here, and be set up as a monument of divine grace and goodness in heavenly places for ever.

No wonder that celestial minds are interested in contemplating the conflicts and triumphs of redeeming mercy; since it is in these, emphatically, that they behold *the grace and the goodness, the patience and forbearance of God*.

We have only to add, that the public are under great obligations to the American Sunday School Union, for bringing out, in so attractive a form, this precious relic of the venerable Bunyan. The engravings which have been annexed are appropriate and beautiful, and will add much to the interest with which the work will be read. We commend it to the study, not only of Sabbath school teachers and scholars, but of the members and ministers of our churches generally.

ARTICLE III.

THE KAREN LANGUAGE.

"THE Karens," wrote Mr. Boardman some twelve years ago, "are divided into two great classes, or nations as they would say, the Myet-thos,* and the Myet-khyans.† These two classes use two dialects so different, that the one understands the other with difficulty." He might have added, that unless they speak the same dialect, or have acquired both, they are quite unintelligible to each other. Still, three-fourths of the roots in the two dialects are, probably, of common origin, though perhaps no two words are exactly alike. The most remarkable difference is, that while Sghau words have no final consonants, many words in Pgcho terminate in the French nasal *n*. Regarding the two dialects as parts of one language, the Karen has *nine* vowels, and *twenty-two* initial consonants.

The vowels are *a* grave, as in *father*.
 ai as in *L'ai*.
 i long, " " *machine*.
 e " " " *there*.
 o " " " *note*.
 au broad, as *a* in *hall*.
 eu as in French.
 u " "
 oo " *u* in *full*.

There are no diphthongs in the language.

The consonants are *k*, *s*, *t*, *p*, and their aspirates *k*, *s*, *t*, *p*, with *b*, *d*, *h*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *w*, *y*, *th*, *sh*, and the three Arabic sounds represented by *Kha*, *Ghain*, and *Ain*.

Sh is found in Pgcho, but never occurs in Sghau. *S* and its aspirate *s* have a little of the flat lingua-dental sound of *t*, and are sometimes written *ts*, and *ts*. The corresponding letters in the Sanscrit family of languages are *ch*, and *chh*, and some of the northern Karens incline slightly to this pronunciation. Hence, *s* in the name of the Karen that came

* Sghau.

† Pgcho.

to America, is always written *ch*—Chet-thing. The sound represented by the Arabic Ghain, is not quite so rough as enunciated by those whom the writer has heard speak the living Shemitish languages. In other respects, it is believed, that the above representatives give a tolerably adequate representation of the powers of the alphabet. It will be observed, that there is no simple *g* in the language, although there is a *g* compounded with another guttural sound in Ghain, and the Septuagint translator renders Ayin (*y*), the corresponding Hebrew letter, when it had this sound by *g*. *G* is wanting, also, in Chinese; but, is a letter of frequent occurrence in Burman. The guttural-nasal *gn* is found in a few words, principally imitations of inarticulate sounds. There are, also, many compound consonants in common use. Thus the compounds of *w* are *kw*, *kw*, *sw*, and others, to the number of sixteen. In like manner *l* is compounded with six other consonants; *r* with eight; *Ghain* with three; *Kha* with one; and *y* with six. Every consonant, unless compounded with another consonant, is accompanied with an inherent short vowel, like a short *eu*.

Of the three great families into which all the languages of Asia resolve themselves, the Hebrew, the Sanscrit, and the Chinese, these alphabetic powers seem to claim most affinity to the Hebrew; but no sooner do we pass from letters to syllables, than we are met by that remarkable feature of the Chinese family,—intonations. The nine Karen vowels have each, (1) a deep, long, even tone; (2) a high sound, pitched several notes above the common tone of conversation, with a rising inflection; (3) an emphatic falling inflection, (4) a circumflex inflection; (5) an inflection like the first, broken off short; and (6) the short sound of the vowel with little reference to inflection.

Thus, in Sghau, *ko*, with the first inflection, signifies *hard*; with the second, *a jug*; with the third, *hot*; with the fourth, *bread*; with the fifth, *neck*; and with the sixth, *call*. Again, *mai*, with the first inflection, signifies to *play on wind instruments*; with the second, *tooth*; with the third, *tail*; with the fourth, *fat*; with the fifth, *eye*; and with the sixth, *sand*.

In Pgho, syllables with the final nasal, are subject to the first four inflections only; and to some ears the fifth and sixth intonations, with final vowels are pronounced with a slight sound of a *k* or *t*, nearly as in Burman where these

finals are written. Wide apart as the significations usually are now, from some remains in the language, it is difficult to resist the impression, that these intonations were *originally* introduced to distinguish related ideas. Thus :

yī	distant in space	yōō	fly
yī	“ “ time	yoō	stretch forth
pgháu	tear	koō	fell trees
pgháu	beat	koō	reap
aú	drink	bleu	immerse
aũ	eat	bleũ	gore, also, dip up, as water.

The finals of the language may be compared with the Chinese, which is characterized by “the absence of consonant terminations, nasals alone excepted, and the frequent recurrence of short vowels at the end of words, which in the Fuhkeen dialect, are commonly altered by the addition of one or other of the mute consonants k, p, t, and usually, also, in the Canton dialect; while in the northern provinces they are drawn out into their corresponding long vowels.” *

As but little correct information is before the public in respect to syllabic languages, some further notice of the Karen may not be unacceptable. “There is,” says a popular work,† “in the south-eastern division of Asia, a group of nations whose languages are distinguished by a singular formation, the like to which is not found in any other part of the globe. The languages of these nations are composed of a very small number of monosyllables.” Now, the Karen has from three to five thousand monosyllabic roots, which cannot with propriety be called “a very small number.” Deceived by the false impression of a paucity of syllables in the language, it was recommended a few years ago, that a Karen missionary should acquire some knowledge of Guess’s Indian alphabet; but, instead of one hundred characters being sufficient, as in Cherokee, to write the Karen on such principles more than three thousand would be necessary; and it would be nearly as arduous a task to acquire Karen as Chinese, which is now written on the same principles as the Cherokee, only a little more systematic; the complexity of the one, and the simplicity of the other, not arising from the difference in the principle of representing the languages, but in consequence of the difference in their structure. The

* Chinese Repository, March, 1835.

† American Encyclopædia, article, *Philology*.

writer quoted above, speaking of the Chinese, and applying his remarks to all the Chin-Indian languages, says, "It has no affixes nor suffixes, no inflections of words, declensions of nouns, nor conjugations of verbs, and but very few auxiliary words, designating the various relations of speech. This extraordinary structure of language extends to the south, to the peninsula of Malacca." Like all other known syllabic languages, the Karen has no inflections, but it is amply provided with prefixes and suffixes, by which most of the relations of speech are made as definite as in other languages. There are affixes for gender and number; and case is distinguished in some instances by position, as the nominative and accusative; in others, by affixes, as the vocative; and in others, by prefixes, as the dative and ablative. There are auxiliary words equivalent to prepositions; the comparative and superlative degrees of comparison of adjectives are distinctly marked by affixes; and there is no want for either personal, reflective, possessive, interrogative, demonstrative, distributive, reciprocal, indefinite, or negative pronouns. The demonstratives often correspond, in their usage, to the definite article in other languages; and they are affixed in the manner that the emphatic state is formed in Chaldee. Like the Hebrew and Greek articles, they are used with "objects previously mentioned, or already known." Thus, *αγγελος* in Luke 1: 11, is rendered in Karen, "an angel," or "one angel," without an affix; but, *ὁ αγγελος* in verse 13, is rendered "the angel," with a demonstrative affixed. By some, it has been stated, as a peculiarity of syllabic languages, that they are destitute of relative pronouns; while others have denied this position. Both statements are correct to a limited extent. In Karen, and the same may be affirmed of the Burman, there is a particle, which is equivalent to a relative pronoun, whenever the antecedent and relative are construed together, without intervening words; but in all other cases the language is destitute of a relative. Thus, "he that sent me," and "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," may be rendered into Karen with a relative; but the sentence, "our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, *which*, also, our fathers that came after brought," cannot be adequately rendered, without repeating the noun at *which*. The Karen has particles to express when attached to verbs, three voices, active, middle, and passive; five moods, indicative, impera-

tive, potential, optative, and subjunctive; three tenses, aorist, perfect, and future; three persons, and two numbers. There are particles to express many other relations under which a verb may appear, resembling Greek prepositions in composition, among which are some that frequently correspond in signification, almost precisely to *αντι, συν, κατα, προ, εν*, and perhaps some others. The usual arrangement of words in a sentence is, that of "*subject, copula, predicate*"; or, when the predicate consists of the verb with its object, *subject, verb, object*. Adverbial designations may stand either before or after the verb; a negative immediately before it," except one form of the negative in Pgho, which stands immediately after the verb. Adjectives usually follow the nouns which they qualify. The nominative case occasionally follows the verb, and the accusative sometimes, but rarely, precedes it. Any part of the sentence may, however, be placed first, and made prominent by putting it in the case absolute. Thus, "the sparrows, their ears are crooked; and the children that eat them, their ears are crooked." "The earth, do you suppose it wide? The earth is not as wide as the Naikai bean." "Obtain, how did he obtain?" Adverbative, exceptive, causal, and hypothetical clauses are required to be placed before those on which they depend; while the illative follows, and the intentional and comparative may either precede or follow. Nouns are repeated to denote multitude. Thus, "nation, nation," signifies many nations. Sometimes they are repeated to express distribution; thus, "he gave to one person a small cup, to one person a small cup," that is, he gave a small cup to each person. Repetition with a conjunction denotes diversity; thus, "one person, and one person," signifies different persons. Verbal roots repeated denote emphasis; thus, "go quick, quick," signifies go very quick; and "weed clean, clean," is equivalent to weed very clean. Words that imitate the sound of the act are often repeated after verbs; thus, a woodman chops, "kloò, kloò;" the waves beat against a ship's side, "thwă, thwă;" fruit falls from a tree, "ă, ă;" the fagots crack in the fire, "pră, pră;" a gate creaks, "krĭ, krĭ;" the drum sounds, "poő, poő;" the thunder claps, "sră, sră," and rolls, "kroò, kroò." Similar reduplications are often used for emphasis, when, from the nature of the case, they cannot be imitative of sound.

Nothing can be more erroneous than the idea that a syllabic language must necessarily be poor in words. To prove this, let us advert, more particularly than we have hitherto done, to the formation of words in Karen. Although each syllabic root is significant, it can scarcely be considered a word. Thus, *tau* signifies little more than *τυτ* in Greek; or at most, *strike* in English, which may be the noun *strike*, or a verb in the infinitive mood, *to strike*, or the imperative, *I strike*, or the subjunctive, *if I strike*, or the potential, *I may strike*, or the imperative, *strike thou*. In like manner, it may be of almost any person or number, and with this final vowel exchanged for an affix, it becomes the noun of agency, *a striker*, or the participle, *striking*, or the adjective, *striking*, or the adverb, *strikingly*. In this way many words in Karen are formed from a single root. Again, two or more roots are compounded to form a word differing in signification from either. Thus, from

eu	bad	and	lau	descend	are	formed	eulau,	degenerate
sgha	few	"	"	"	"	"	sghalau,	lessen
à	many	"	tau	ascend	"	"	àtau,	increase
mà	make	"	bu	paddy	"	"	màbu,	harvest.

Roots may be compounded in this manner to any extent with almost as much facility as compounds are formed in Greek. Indeed, I think *tà-mà ti-kai-tau*, the *water-producer*, is as good in Karen as hydrogen is in Greek. It is a further principle in the language, to form the names of the parts from the root that designates the whole. In this manner, from the name of a member of the body, are formed all the parts of that member, for which separate words are usually found in other languages. Thus *eu*, *arm*, with *neu-ki*, *corner*, forms *eu-neu-ki*, the *elbow*; with *là*, *leaf*, it forms *eu-là*, the *hand*; with *ko*, *head*, it forms *eu-ko*, the *fist*; and so on to the amount of more than *forty* different words, designating some part of the hand or arm. In a similar way, more than *twenty* words are formed from the syllabic root that designates the eye; and so with words that designate other parts of the body. In Karen many new roots are formed by prefixing to other roots one of the smooth mutes, with its inherent vowel, *k'*, *ts'* (or *s'*), *t'*, *p'*. Thus, from *ú*, the cry of a monkey, is formed *k'sú*, groan; and from *māi*, play on wind instruments, is formed *k'-māi*, make melodious sounds. This trait seems to be a connecting

link between a monosyllabic and polysyllabic language; being decidedly of the latter character. All the modes of forming new words have not been enumerated; but enough has been said to prove that the Karen language is sufficiently copious for all the ideas possessed by those who speak it.

Another common error is, that syllabic languages are vague, that they "are satisfied with awaking leading ideas; all that is merely accessory or auxiliary being understood."* So far as the knowledge of the people extends, few languages can better distinguish things that differ than the Karen. In Greek, the prince of languages for precision, the verb *to be* is used in the signification of (1) be, exist; (2) come to be, come into existence; (3) be for any thing, become; (4) as a logical copulate, connecting the subject with the predicate; but for these several significations four different words are used in Karen. Thus:

"In the beginning was [*ἦν*] the word." (John 1: 1.) Here *ō* is used in Karen.

"Great signs shall there be [*ἔσονται*]." (Luke 21: 11.) Here *mā a'-thā* is used in Karen.

"The two shall be [*ἔσονται*] one flesh." (Matt. 19: 5.) Here *kai* is used in Karen.

"His food was [*ἦν*] locusts." (Matt. 3: 4.) Here *mè* is used in Karen.

In English we say:

"I cannot copy this book, it is too much for me.

I cannot copy this book, I have cut my finger.

I cannot copy this book, I have no paper.

I cannot copy this book, I have the proof sheets to read."

Here the word that denotes inability is the same in all the four examples, as it would be in most languages; but in Karen, four different words must be used, because the inability arises from four different causes, which in Karen are always distinguished. In the first example, the difficulty is in the thing to be done, the work is too great; in the second, the inability lies in the agent; in the third, the obstacles lie in things external to both the work and the agent; and in the fourth, there are other things that must be attended to first. Similar remarks might be made on many other words. It will

* See *Encyclopædia Americana*.

be easily seen that to translate *correctly* into such a language, must be a work of no small difficulty, and require no little discrimination.

It is a peculiar feature of the Karen language to use words in pairs in the signification of one of the words used. Thus *frog, fish*, are used in the signification of *fish*; *horse, elephant*, in the signification of *elephant*; *plant, immerse*, in the signification of *plant*. Often the coupled non-significant word seems to be chosen from some connection between the object it properly denotes and the word with which it is coupled. Thus *paddy, rice* are used to signify *rice*; *boiled water, rice*, to signify *boiled rice*; and *tree, bamboo*, to signify *tree*. Sometimes the couplet is a foreign word signifying, in the language from which it is taken, the same thing as the Karen word with which it is coupled. Thus, *tí* and *nó* are used in the signification of *tí*, water, where *nó* is the Siamese word for water, *nam*; in Pgho, *me* and *thwa* are used in the signification of *me*, tooth, where *thwa* is the Burman word for tooth; and in Sghau, *wí* and *man* are used for *wí*, prophet, where *man* is the Pgho word for prophet. The coupled word frequently serves to distinguish the different significations of the same root. Thus *ō* with *yeu* signifies *exist*; but with *sō*, *remain*; *kaí* with *lō* signifies *become*; but with *káu*, *be in health*; and *sā* with *pau* signifies *star*; but with *kaù*, *animal*.

The vocables of the language often seem to point to an occidental origin. The monosyllabic roots by which the Hebrews expressed the idea of cutting are קָטַע, כָּסַח, כָּרַח; and excepting *wō*, her, *sghān* and *dañ* to mince, cut into small pieces; *ghaĩ*, to cut open, and *loo*, to shave, all the Karen words by which this idea is expressed contain the initial of one or other of the above roots.

Thus *koō*, to fell as trees; *kōo*, reap; *kū*, strip bark of trees; *kháu*, cut into form; *klō*, hew out; *kwāi*, scratch, make slight incisions; *pā*, divide; *pāi*, clear land; *pghāi*, rip up; *plā*, hew with an edge; *pāi*, chop; *ploō*, chop to pieces; *blā*, split; *beĩ*, hew; *blaú*, chop to pieces; *thwáu*, cut right and left; and *thwaĩ*, cut to a point. In like manner, the Hebrew makes the words to *beat, bruise* from the monosyllabic root כָּדַח; and most of the words signifying to *strike, beat*, are made in Karen from this initial or its corresponding mute. Thus, *dái*, slap; *dó*, beat, as a drum; *dwá*, strike a thing, as

in passing; *taù*, strike; *tò*, beat as paddy in a mortar; *tī*, beat as cymbals; *tó* strike with the fist; and *twā*, shove, push. There are some resemblances in the pronouns. Of the first person singular, Nordheimer says, "The principal vowel is *i*, *or y*, which occurs in the Indo-European languages, e. g. Russ., *ya*, Span., *yo*, Dan. *yeg*." In Karen, it is *yeü* and *ya*. "The principal element," he adds, "of the second person is *n*, *th*, or *t*," and the plural of this person in Karen is *thú*. With the third person *ווי*, Heb. and *wi*, Pers. may be compared the Karen forms *au*, and *eú*, *wai*. Many other coincidences might be produced, but enough has been offered for a specimen, and perhaps more than will interest most readers. No sketch, however, of the Karen language can be deemed complete without some notice of the poetry. Karen poetry is usually written in lines of seven syllables, a common measure in Chinese. For example :

Miss T-ú, her feet are small,
She lives at home, dusts the house.

Miss T-ú, her feet are weak,
She lives at home, dusts the couch.*

Occasionally the lines consist of five syllables only; as,

We love not to die;
The Great treats us thus.
We love not to go:
The Great makes us mad.

It is essential to Karen poetry that it be written in rhyme, another feature in common with Chinese. For instance:

Children, be happy and play,
The mountain a plain yet will be.
Children, bid sorrow away,
We yet shall be happy and free.

In common, also, with Chinese, the lines are often made to rhyme with the same word. Thus:

The waters will be destroyed, the earth rise;
The lands will be destroyed, the earth rise.

The same word is often repeated in the same line, for the sake of euphony; as,

The men of peace, the men of peace,
Shall dwell in the town, in the city.

* This is Karen poetry, though there is an evident allusion to Chinese habits.

Karen poetry, unlike that of the Chinese, and other trans-gangetic nations, is written in parallel lines. Sometimes the second line corresponds to the first; as,

God, about to return, commanded,
God, about to go, commanded.

Often the third line corresponds to the first, and the fourth to the second. Thus:

The great dragon took yellow fruit,
Gave to eat to God's male child and daughter.
The great dragon took white fruit,
Gave to eat to God's son and daughter.

Sometimes there is a parallelism of stanzas, as well as of the lines in each stanza; as,

The Salwen, that runs back,
The Sitaing, that runs back.
He that can make crooked is God,
He that can make straight is God.

The Salwen that turns back,
The Sitaing that turns back.
He that can make crooked is Tháu-yi,
He that can make straight is Tháu-yi.

Sometimes the second stanza contains the interpretation of the figure in the first; as,

The measure of traps for animals is seven hand-breadths,
The measure of traps for quadrupeds is seven hand-breadths,
That for which there is no measure is the turtle,
He runs, runs, and reaches his bed.

The measures of traps for animals are seven hundred,
The measures of traps for quadrupeds, are seven hundred.
Those for whom there is no measure, are we,
We run, run, and reach our beds.

Sometimes the only difference in the parallel lines is a difference in their arrangement, the words being the same in both. Thus:

He smote the massy rock with a bamboo;
The massy rock he smote with a bamboo.
He smote the massy rock, the rock ascended,
The massy rock he smote, the rock ascended.

More usually there is a change of a single word, of the same signification, one being the couplet of the other; as,

The wind blows, the Casnarina leaf trembles;
 The Mascas deceives the Alligator.
 The wind blows, the Casnarina leaf shakes,
 The Mascas deceives the Dragon.

The word dragon is here the couplet to alligator, and the signification, the same as if alligator were used in both lines. Again :

The elders anciently ate the branch of heaven,
 The elders anciently ate the branch of earth.

Here the word earth is the couplet of heaven, and the signification the same as if heaven were used in its place.

There is often a slight change in the words, without any change in the sentiment ; as,

They transgressed the words of God,
 God turned his back on them.
 Having transgressed the words of God,
 God afterwards turned his back on them.

Sometimes the sentiment is varied a little ; as,

The wooden pestle, the wooden mortar,
 Paddy shall beat itself clean.
 The bamboo fan, the bamboo mat,
 Paddy shall spread itself out to dry.
 Rice shall cook itself,
 We dwell, we sleep, we eat.
 Without having to grind or cook,
 We shall have every thing ready to eat.*

Sometimes one distich is connected with the preceding, by repeating one or more of its words. Thus :

The great God comes down, comes down ;
 The mighty God comes down, comes down.
 He comes blowing the horn,
 He comes blowing the trumpet.
 He blows and obtains men as the Areca flowers,
 He sounds and obtains men as the wild Areca flowers.

In closing a piece of composition the last line or couplet departs from the parallelism : as,

When the generation arrives, the time comes,
 When the age arrives, the time comes,
 Woman will obtain two husbands,
 Man will obtain two wives.
 It will not meet the mind of God,
 He will strike the thunder, the earth will quake.

* That is in the Karen Millennium.

Again :

The glory, the angels of heaven,
The glory, the messengers of heaven,
When God comes, blowing the great trumpet,
The great will strike the golden harp.

Much of the poetry has a dialogue character, and a single specimen shall close this article; a specimen that came from the lips of as wild a Karen as ever trod the forest; yet, "rough hewn" though it be, it would not disgrace a divinity hall.

Q. Sparrows,* black and red,
To the happy land, which way is your mind?
Sparrows, black and white,
Which way is your mind, to the happy land?

A. Sparrows, black and white,
Happiness is with the one God:
Sparrows, black and red,
Happiness is in the presence of God.

ARTICLE IV.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

DIVINE truth is the instrument by which the Holy Spirit is to sanctify the church. Through no other means do we expect spiritual life to be either communicated or sustained. The church of Christ, therefore, can truly prosper, only as she is nourished by the sincere milk and the strong meat of God's word. In proportion as any of the doctrines of the gospel are withheld, she is deprived of the means of spiritual growth and strength; if these doctrines are mingled with error, poison is mingled with her daily food, which either occasions debility and languor, or operates as a false stimulant, exciting a feverish and unnatural action, which is no more a sign of spiritual vigor, than the hectic flush is of natural health.

Few, perhaps, will formally dissent from this sentiment; yet a zeal for the purity of Christian doctrine is by no means a

* Men are here intended.

distinguishing characteristic of the present age. Zeal for action is not always combined with a zeal for truth. Men are urged to the adoption and profession of the Christian faith, without being taught with sufficient explicitness what that faith is. Every method is employed to arouse and alarm the mind ; some are predicting the speedy approach of the Judgment, and some, of the Millennium. Some are prognosticating scenes of coming calamity and terror, and some are promising halcyon days of peace and prosperity to the church ; while there appears to be a hushed stillness with regard to many of the prominent doctrines of the gospel. Often, indeed, there is something worse than silence ; there is an implied intimation that some of these doctrines stand in the way of the sinner's conversion, and of the practice of Christian duty.

Now there may indeed be many mistaken views of the doctrines of the Bible, which must necessarily operate against the progress of piety ; but a little patient instruction might correct such views, vindicate the purity of these doctrines, and present them in such a light, that they would become the most efficient means for the conversion of the sinner and the edification of the Christian. But the spirit of the age favors not sobriety of discussion. It is better pleased with whatever is novel, startling or paradoxical ; so that those who are disposed to yield to the general current of things may find it much more easy to neglect or apparently deny some particular doctrines, than to command a patient hearing while they attempt to vindicate or explain them. Under such an order of things, it would be no matter of surprise, should many be found in the bosom of the evangelical church who are ignorant of their own hearts, uninstructed in the doctrines of the gospel, and ready to welcome almost any form of error which is introduced under the garb of novelty, and which claims for itself a rank among the amazing discoveries and improvements of modern times.

The doctrine of the attainableness of perfect holiness in the present life is one which is now claiming our favorable regards, upon the authority of such captivating and plausible recommendations. And, as is very natural, it meets with a varied reception from different orders of minds. Some regard it as an innocent and harmless intruder into the circle of their long-cherished sentiments ; some are hailing it with enthusi-

asm as the bow of promise, or as the morning-star which is to usher in the millennial glory; while others, and we think all must rank among these who have an enlightened and consistent view of the gospel, regard it as the offspring of a pernicious root, which, though long buried in the ground, and apparently dead, is again shooting forth its stock and branches, and is destined to infect and poison the very atmosphere that surrounds it.

We here attempt a brief review of some of the controversies in relation to this doctrine in ancient and modern times. In the course of our remarks, it will be seen, that this is by no means among the glorious things which have, for the first time, been discovered in the twilight of the millennial morn; that, so far as it is a discovery, it is one of a darker age; and that the darkest age was the period of its highest glory. As many are supposing that such a doctrine can surely do no harm, it will also be made to appear, that wherever it has been received, it has been generally attended with the most injurious consequences. There have, indeed, been in every age those whose defective views of the condition of man have allowed them to see but few obstacles to the perfection of human nature. In this, our own age is not peculiar. But we have nothing of sinless perfection in the present life, among the earlier fathers of the church. The language of Origen is, "Say ye, says Christ, that ye are unprofitable servants. For notwithstanding we have done all things that are commanded, yet, have we done no good thing. For, if our doings were good indeed, then were we not unprofitable. But any good deed of ours is called good, not rightly and deservedly, but by abuse of speech."* Cyprian also says, "Let no one flatter himself that he has a pure and unspotted heart, that, confiding in his own innocency, he should suppose that his wounds need no medicine, since it is written, 'Who can say I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?' Prov. 20: 9. 1 John 1: 10. But if no one can be without sin, whoever shall say that he is blameless is either a proud man or a fool."† Again, says Ambrose, "there is no such harmony found in any one man that the law which is in his

* Jewell's Defence of his Apology.

† Cyprian De Opere et Eleemosynis, III. Si autem nemo esse sine peccato potest, quisquis inculpatum se esse dixerit, aut superbus aut stultus est.

members does not oppose the law of his mind, therefore that which the apostle John said is true, 'If we say we have no sin,' &c."

The first principal controversy in relation to this subject took its rise in the age of Pelagius and Augustine. Pelagius, while at Rome, had heard his Bishop quote from the confessions of Augustine the following language, "*Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis,*" which contains a most pious and profoundly devotional sentiment. Against this, Pelagius most vehemently protested. He considered it insufferably profane to ask God to do for us, what we are commanded to do ourselves, and what he supposed we had abundant power to do, without divine aid. His subsequent acquaintance with Augustine brought out many other points of difference between them.* From the theory of Pelagius respecting the nature of man, the attainableness of sinless perfection in this life resulted as a natural and necessary consequence. Accordingly, it was maintained, both by himself and his followers, that men are not only born without contamination, but that they may even recover themselves from the influence of long habits of sin, and attain to perfect holiness. They, however, were often driven to the reluctant concession, that this could only be done through the aid of divine grace. With this concession, Augustine at first regarded the sentiment as comparatively harmless, and felt no special alarm. He was unwilling to say that perfect obedience was in every sense impossible to man, lest he should not only depreciate the human faculties, but detract from the power of God. Yet, he maintained that no mere man had ever yet been found, who had attained to this sinless state. It was not long, however, before the injurious effects of this doctrine began to be developed. Pelagius, while in Palestine, was summoned on a charge of heresy, before a council held at Diospolis, A. D. 415. At this council fourteen Palestine Bishops were present. Among the charges here brought against him, one was that he taught that "man may live without sin, if he will." To which he replies, "I have indeed said that man may be without sin and keep God's commands, if he will; for this ability God has given him; but I have not said that any one can be found from infancy to old age who has

* For an excellent digest of the principles of Pelagius, see an article by Dr. Sears, Christ. Rev., No. XI, Art. 7.

not sinned ; but being converted from sin, by his own labor and God's grace, he can be without sin ; still he is not by this immutable for the future." But several of the Bishops still continuing to murmur that Pelagius did not more fully acknowledge the necessity of God's aid, he at length replied, "I also believe ; anathema to him who says that man can attain to all the virtues without God's aid." He was confronted with the following passage from the Book of Celestius, one of his disciples : "Those cannot be called the sons of God who have not become in every respect free from sin. Forgetfulness and ignorance are not matters of sin, as they do not take place according to the will, but of necessity. There is no free will, if it needs God's aid ; since every one has it in his own will either to do or not to do a thing. Our victory is not from God's aid, but from free will." To this he waived a reply, refusing to be responsible for what he had not written. From this council, his principal accusers were providentially detained ; and, as the Greek Bishops had little acquaintance with the Latin language, in which the works of Pelagius were written, they could not know whether his writings contradicted his confessions or not. Through the efforts, therefore, of Annianus, a learned and eloquent friend of Pelagius, the council managed in some way to acquit the man, while they condemned his principal errors. It is said also that this result was owing, in part, to the dissimulation and equivocation of Pelagius himself.*

It subsequently appeared that, although Pelagius admitted the necessity of divine grace, in order to freedom from sin, yet his whole views of the nature of grace differed materially from those generally held by the church. This did not escape the keen observation of Augustine. He resolved grace into our mere natural powers and the ability to use them ; and although he admitted that God illuminates, restrains, incites and even sanctifies, yet, "he so explained these words to his disciples," says Augustine, "that they believe in no aid of grace, by which the ability of nature is assisted, except by the law and doctrine." That is, God sanctifies by giving us light through his law and doctrine, teaching us our duty and removing ignorance, while the ability to do and the inclination of the will are from man.

* Prof. Emerson's translation of Wigger's Pelagianism. Chap. IX, X.

We need not pause here to show how closely he is followed, in his whole views of grace, by the Pelagians of our own times.

After the council at Diospolis, an increasing dissatisfaction was felt with the doctrines of Pelagius. He was pressed hard with numerous objections. It was said, that if man is born pure, he may die sinless, and never need the mediation of Christ. To this he readily assented. His opinion was, that as a matter of course the atonement of Christ would be needed only by the actual transgressor,—that if infants were saved by grace, it could only be in the same sense as they receive their existence by grace; but not by grace, in the sense of *pardon and mercy*. To his doctrine of sinless perfection was objected the language of John, “If we say we have no sin,” &c. The reply was, it does not become us on the score of humility to say, we have no sin, though it might be said in strict accordance with truth. It was objected that the perfect could not conscientiously use the Lord’s prayer, as it would require a daily confession of sin, where there was no daily guilt. It was replied, that a perfect man might say, forgive *us* our sins, while he intended that part of the prayer only for his brethren, who had not yet made the same attainments with himself. No wonder that Augustine became disgusted with such profane and despicable trifling, and that he soon lost all the little sympathy he ever had for a sentiment so startling in its results! Hear his language to Boniface, in a letter written about this period. “The virtue which is now in a righteous man is called *perfect* on the account that it belongs to his perfection both to acknowledge in truth and confess in humility his own imperfection.” To the same effect is the language of Jerome to Ctesiphon: “This is men’s only perfection, to know themselves imperfect.”

About three years after the council of Diospolis, another was convened in Carthage, composed of all the African Bishops. Here Pelagius and his doctrines were condemned. In the canons of this council it is said, “Whosoever thinks that what the apostle John says, ‘If we say we have no sin,’ &c., is to be received, as if it were to say, it does not become us on the score of humility, not that of truth, to say, we have no sin, let him be anathema. Whoever will have those words of the Lord’s prayer, “Forgive us our debts,” to be so spoken by saints

as if they were not humbly and truly said, let him be anathema. For who would endure one praying and lying, not to men, but to God himself, who, with his lips, says he wishes to be forgiven, and, in his heart, says he has no debts to be forgiven!" Much more in relation to this subject is found in these canons; but we forbear farther quotation, as they are made accessible to the English reader by Prof. Emerson's excellent translation of Wigger's Pelagianism. After this council, it is said that Augustine could no longer endure the doctrine of man's ability to be without sin, even with the assistance of grace. And from this time it was treated by the bishops, of the western church generally, as a condemned heresy. But though Pelagianism was here condemned, it was still destined to live in many a mind. While the sentiments of Augustine have always remained those of the greater portion of the evangelical church, the sentiments of Pelagius have sowed the seeds of Socinianism, and, according to Wigger, prepared the way for what is now called German Rationalism.

We are now to leave the doctrine as taught by Pelagius, and trace it into subsequent ages. But we here pause to say, that Pelagianism as a system, however discordant with the word of God, is, at least, consistent with itself. It is a unique, harmonious whole; as a whole, it must be received, or, as a whole, rejected. Its author possessed a polished and powerful mind; his positions were cautiously and deliberately taken; some of them rather from necessity than from choice, as the natural result of his fundamental principles. His doctrine of perfection proceeded not from any special zeal for holiness, but was forced upon him by his views of man's moral character, and by his theory of grace. Pelagianism produced perfectionism; perfectionism demands Pelagianism for its support; it can flourish in no other soil; it cannot be engrafted upon our evangelical scheme; it can derive thence no congenial nourishment; it may adhere for a while to the surface; but must ultimately be thrown off by the very action of vitality. Wherever we find it growing in luxuriance, we may therefore know the nature of the soil upon which we tread. Before the evangelical church can admit perfection into her creed, she must tear up from their old foundations some of her most important and long-cherished doctrines. She must modify her whole views of human depravity, of the nature of regeneration, of the Spirit's influence, and of the

holiness of the divine law. She must allow either that grace is nothing but the free use of our faculties ; or, that it is conferred according to human merit ; and the final step must be to exchange the doctrine of justification by faith, for that which teaches that there is no reconciliation to God without a perfect obedience to the law.

Lest these should seem like groundless insinuations, let the farther history of this doctrine be deliberately considered. Scarcely had Augustine laid aside the thunders of his eloquence, when the scattered fragments of the Pelagian scheme were collected under a new heresiarch, John Cassian, who reduced them to the form and order of a system, possessing, however, by no means the harmony and symmetry of the original. This new system, Semi-Pelagianism, was truly permitted to enjoy a millennial reign. After Augustine and his immediate disciples were called from their labors, it experienced but comparatively feeble opposition in the Catholic church during the whole dark period, from the time of Augustine to that of Luther. During this period, the doctrine of perfection especially seems to have struck its deepest roots. Monachism had already prepared for it a suitable soil. The fires of martyrdom having burned out, and the horrors of the stake being no longer attainable, the bigoted and fanatical were seeking in the convent and cloister that perfection, which they supposed could never be found amid the practical concerns of life. These were ready to welcome any doctrine that would seem to enhance the merit of their monastic penances ; and to listen to the dreams of those who fancied that, even while on earth, they had attained the holiness of heaven.

Occasionally, indeed, we hear the tones of remonstrance from the dark cell of some pious monk, whom the grace of God had truly enlightened with regard to the iniquity of his own heart. Bernard, whose writings Luther is said to have valued above those of all other monks and priests together, exclaims : " Who dares to arrogate to himself that which Paul himself confesses he had never attained ? Indeed, he who gave the command was not ignorant, that the weight thereof exceeds the strength of man ; but he judged it useful, that by this very thing they should be convinced of their own insufficiency, and that they might know to what end of righteousness they should endeavor with all their might to attain. By

commanding things impossible, therefore, he did not make men transgressors, but humble, that every mouth might be stopped and all the world might lie under the judgment of God." But such remonstrance failed to arrest the error. Its progress is thus described by one whose historical veracity will not be questioned. "The danger of the doctrine (Pelagianism) appeared in this; that by placing goodness in the external act, rather than in the inward affections, it led men to put a high value upon outward action, legal observances and works of penance. The more of such works, the greater the reputed sanctity—heaven was to be attained by means of these—and, extravagant as such a thought must appear to us, it was not long before certain persons were believed to have made attainments in holiness, beyond that which was required of them."* The doctrine gradually obtained, that men could not only be perfect, but more than perfect. Hence, we find that the system of Indulgences, that crowning abomination of Popery, derived its principal support from this said doctrine of perfection. The system of indulgences, according to Neander, originated, at first, in an innocent commutation of ecclesiastical inflictions; but under the moulding hand of Alexander Hales, Albert Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, it was brought into that perfected form, in which it constituted the very acme of the disease, which had for ages been infecting the Catholic church. It was in some way discovered that the merit of those unnumbered saints, who had become more than perfect, could be constructed into a treasure, from which the wants of those could be supplied who were still imperfect, and upon which an occasional draft could be made in favor of any who might desire indulgence in special sins. This treasure was called "*thesaurus supererogationis perfectorum*," the treasure of the supererogatory works of the perfect. This treasure was vast and inexhaustible; and to the Pope, who held the power of the keys, it became a source of immense revenue. It was declared sufficient for the pardon both of the living and of the dead; and pardon thus obtained, was to be valid not only at the bar of the church, but at the bar of God. Since "*Deus habet pro relaxato quod ecclesia relaxat*," God regards as remitted whatever the church remits. What, then, is Indulgence? Let Albert Magnus reply; "*Indulgentia*

* Merle D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation.

I. Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History Notes, vol. II, chap. 6.

sive relaxatio est remissio poenae injunctae, ex vi clavorum et thesauro supererogationis perfectorum procedens," Indulgence, or absolution, is the remission of enjoined punishment, proceeding from the power of the keys, and the treasure of the superfluous works of the perfect. And lest this treasure should seem in danger of exhaustion from the numerous applications, it was occasionally represented as being connected with the merits of Christ; so that all crime could find indulgence, and the most atrocious and monstrous abominations might be practised with impunity.

But, alas! where are those perfected ones, whose merits are to be placed on a level with the merits of Christ? Where are we to look for those, whose superfluous holiness is to be constructed into this mysterious treasure? We look in vain for such among the meek and lowly followers of the Lamb; for these have always acknowledged themselves "unprofitable servants;" and the only perfect righteousness they have ever claimed is their justification by faith. And had they, indeed, ever transcended in righteousness the requirements of the law, their exalted attainments, in view of the use that has been made of them, might well now occasion them bitterness of regret even in heaven; for, if the new-born soul, just entering upon the joys of pardon, is almost compelled to exclaim, "*O beata culpa, quae tantum meruisti Redemptorem!*" O blessed fault, which hast obtained for me such a Redeemer!" surely these glorified saints must wring their hands in their blissful seats, and exclaim with anguish of spirit, O accursed merit, by which we have furnished indulgence to such hideous forms of iniquity and crime, and opened the flood-gates of vice upon the militant church!

From the above considerations, it is not surprising that the attainableness of entire perfection in the present life became a favorite dogma with almost the whole Catholic church. All sects, however discordant in other particulars, seemed to harmonize in this. The caviling schoolmen here found scarcely any thing, against which to direct their shafts. The subtle Duns Scotus, of the Platonic school, and the angelic Aquinas, his antagonist, here concurred in opinion. Scotus maintained that, even the heathen sometimes fulfilled the whole law, referring for proof to Rom. 14: 11.* Thomas

* Rom. 14: 11, ubi videtur Apostolus increpare Judaeos in hoc, quod gentes sine lege data servabant legem, ergo cavebant ab omni peccato; et tamen, ut videtur, non habuerunt gratiam. Sent. Dist. 28, Gieseler's Notes.

Aquinas, who defended the general views of Augustine, differed widely from his master in relation to the efficacy of good works ; few talked louder or longer than he of the merit of *congruity* and *condignity*. While he agreed with Duns Scotus, that perfection was attainable and often attained, yet he supposed that this could in no case be done without the aid of infused grace (*sine habitu infuso*). These distinguished opponents imparted their names, as well as their sentiments, to their respective followers, who were subsequently known by the designation of Thomists and Scotists.

We now proceed to contemplate this doctrine in relation to consequences, if possible, still more disastrous. We allude to the influence it exerted in drawing down darkness and obscurity upon God's revealed method of justification by faith. The system of indulgences and of priestly absolution might satisfy the thoughtless and hypocritical ; but could never afford relief to those who had become deeply sensible of the evil of sin, and had experienced the bitterness of genuine conviction. If, therefore, the doctrine of justification by faith had only been allowed an occasional public advocate, these might have left the crowd to follow the various forms of papal delusion, while they themselves could have sought for peace by believing in Jesus. But, without this consolatory doctrine, what remained to the convicted sinner, but to pine in despondency or practise monkish austerities, which had not the least tendency to mitigate the anguish of a guilty conscience. This was the condition of Luther, when the pious Staupits came to his relief, pointed him to the cross of Christ, and bade him believe and live. The poor, dejected, care-worn monk was surprised at this new doctrine. He almost fancied that he was listening to the soft tones of some heavenly message sent for his special comfort ; he was at once humbled and cheered by the accents of mercy, and was glad to acquiesce in that method of pardon, which it was afterwards the business of his life to preach. But the notion of human merit and the possibility of fulfilling the whole law, had obscured the doctrine of faith. Justification, it was admitted, could be secured only by a perfect righteousness ; but this the saints could possess in the merit of their own good works and penances. The merit of works was raised, the standard of the law lowered ; grace might be necessary at the commencement of a religious life, and by some was admitted to be necessary in

every state of our progress ; but grace and faith were valued, not because they bring us into such a relation to Christ, that we are justified by his righteousness, but because they enabled us to work out a righteousness, which in itself is justifying and satisfactory to the law. The importance of grace was often urged ; the excellence of faith often dwelt upon ; but grace and faith were empty sounds, unless they produced within us a righteousness corresponding to the requirements of the law. Thus, the cross of Christ was forsaken, and human merit was relied upon, as the only hope of salvation. This whole perverted view of the gospel could have had no foundation, except in the doctrine which taught the attainableness of perfect holiness in the present life.

This doctrine seems to have been taken under the special patronage of the followers of Loyola, the most virulent and indefatigable enemies of the Reformation. Bellarmine, one of the purest and most enlightened of his order, did not hesitate to declare, that by our own merits we might not only satisfy the law, but make God our debtor. His language is, "*Non ex sola promissione sed etiam ex opere nostro, Deus efficitur debitor,*" God is made our debtor, not merely by his own promise, but even by our works. But there were a few, who could not receive a sentiment so gross and impious. Jansenius, the founder of the order which bore his name, and a bold defender of the sentiments of Augustine, maintained that it was impossible for believers to fulfil, in every particular, the divine law, since it was not given to them to enjoy in the present life the requisite degree of grace. This was one of the articles of his faith, for which he suffered the anathema of Pope Innocent X. But in this he was subsequently sustained by some of the most pious and enlightened minds in the Catholic church ; among whom were the polished and eloquent scholars of Port Royal, who constituted at once the lights and ornaments of their age. It may be recollected, also, that this was one of the points in dispute between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, to which Pascal alludes in his Provincial Letters, where he raises his powerful pen to make the whole Jesuit fraternity the scorn and laughing-stock of Europe.

This doctrine interposed one of the most formidable obstacles to the progress of the Reformation. It is not surprising that we should find the Reformers, therefore, directing against

it their united energies. They justly supposed that to overthrow this would be to remove the very foundation-stone of the whole papal edifice. In order to restore to its primitive importance that fundamental article of Christianity—justification by faith—they found it absolutely essential that men should be convinced of the depravity and wickedness of the human heart, and that their confidence should be shaken in the merit and perfection of even the best human performances. Accordingly, wherever we find them advocating the doctrine of justification by faith alone, we find them, also, inculcating the sentiment, that the holiest acts of the saints are still imperfect and mingled with sin. While, therefore, the Council of Trent decided in favor of the attainableness of perfection in the present life, this doctrine was boldly denied by the Augsburg Confession of Faith, prepared by Luther and Melancthon. And Melancthon in his Apology for this Confession, as well as in his *Loci Theologici*, records his protest and his strong arguments against this doctrine. That our readers may be favored with his views on this subject, we here present a few of his remarks :

“In fine, there remains even in the regenerate a mass of sin which transcends the comprehension of man; nor do we regard that as a light saying, ‘Who can understand his errors?’ It would be tedious to enumerate the various kinds of sin which remain in the saints; but Paul seems to sum them up, Rom. 7, where he speaks of our inward opposition to all the commands. But proud hypocrites understand not these secret sins; nay, the monks teach that doubts concerning providence and the wrath and mercy of God, and that corrupt affections, unless we yield to them our consent, are not sinful. Nor is their error merely verbal; it is substantial; they deny that these vices are repugnant to the divine law. This is false and insulting to the law of God; it brings darkness upon the doctrine of grace and of justification by faith, and establishes a deceptive persuasion that the righteous can satisfy the law of God.

“That this arrogance may be reprov’d, I shall present testimonies which show that the regenerate, in this life, do not satisfy the law of God, and that the remains of sin are still found in this perishable nature. Psal. 143: 2, ‘Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight no man living shall be justified.’ 1 John 1: 8, ‘If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.’ Psal. 19: 12, ‘Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret sins, and save thy servant from flagrant vices.’ Rom. 7: 23, ‘I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members.’ And although the sophists attempt to wrest this passage, by saying that there is a *metalepsis* in the word *sin*, and that it means the punishment of sin,—the propensity to sin, occasioned by the fall of our first parents,—yet this is contradicted by Paul’s own language, when he defines this

itself to be sin, and says that it is evil in our members, contending against the law of God.

"In Matt. 6: 12, the saints are taught to pray,—'Forgive us our debts:' there are sins, therefore, remaining throughout our whole lives, the forgiveness of which is to be sought. The same is taught where it is said, 'When ye have done all, say, we are unprofitable servants.' Paul says, 1 Cor. 4: 4, 'I am conscious to myself of nothing (of no wilful neglect of duty), yet am I not hereby justified.' He teaches that there is need of a good conscience; but, yet he adds, this is not a sufficient ground of assurance that I have received remission of sin and reconciliation with God; but God receives me through faith, for the sake of his Son, our Mediator. Psal. 130: 3, 'If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand?' By this language the Psalmist acknowledges that sin remains, and he palliates it not. . . . Dan. 9: 7—9, 'O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion;' that is, we acknowledge that thou art just, and that we are justly punished; but with thee, O Lord our God, is mercy and compassion; we pray, therefore, not on account of our own righteousness, but for thy great mercies' sake; hear us, for the Lord's sake; that is, for the sake of the promised Mediator. This passage furnishes a clear testimony to the agreement of Apostles and Prophets. Daniel directly teaches what Paul so fully maintains, that the nature of man is depraved, and cannot satisfy the law; yet that we can be truly accepted of God through mercy, for the sake of our promised Lord; for Daniel expressly adds, *for the Lord's sake*. Let us compare such testimonies with Paul, that we may see that the sentiment of the universal church,—of the Fathers, of the Prophets, of Christ, and of the Apostles is one and invariable; and let us embrace this sentiment, in which all agree, and never abandon it, although a host of modern monks have inculcated a different opinion, by mingling a corrupt philosophy with the doctrine of the gospel.

"1 Cor. 1: 31, 'He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord;' that is, we cannot glory that we are without sin; but let us glory in the Lord, who promiseth mercy. As is elsewhere stated, 'He includes all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all.' . . . Let us acknowledge, therefore, our weakness, and let us confess that there are sins even in the regenerate, that is to say, depravity of nature and many corrupt affections. Let us tremble at the wrath of God, revealed against these evils; let us mourn that we have hitherto so often transgressed his will; let true penitence spring up within us; let a knowledge of our own weakness banish pride, render us submissive to God, and excite us to fear God, and implore his mercy and assistance.* . . .

"But why prolong discussion? The whole Scripture, the whole church, proclaim that the law is not satisfied. Our imperfect fulfilment of the law, therefore, is not pleasing in itself, but only on account of faith in Christ. Irrespective of this, the law always accuses us; for who sufficiently loves and fears God? Who sustains with sufficient patience the afflictions which God sends? Who does not frequently doubt, whether human affairs are not governed by chance, rather than by the counsel of God? Who does not often doubt whether God hears prayer? Who is not often angry that wicked men prosper more than the righteous, and that the righteous are oppressed by the wicked?

* Loci Theologici, De bonis operibus. See, also, De argumentis adversoribus.

Who completely fulfils his own vocation? Who loves his neighbor as himself? Who is unmoved by concupiscence? Therefore, says Paul, 'the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do.' And again, 'With the mind I serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.' Here he openly declares that he serves the law of sin.*

The most learned and able defence of the doctrine of perfection, which appeared either during or since the Reformation, was written by a learned Portuguese Jesuit, Jerome Osorio, bishop of Sylves, in Algarva. It consists of a Latin treatise, entitled *De Justitia Cælesti*, in which he enters into a labored defence of the whole Romish doctrine of justification. It is curious to see this learned Jesuit, employing many of the very same arguments and referring to the same passages of Scripture in proof of the doctrine of perfection, which are resorted to for the purpose at the present day. He abounds in beautiful passages upon the holiness of God, and the excellency and loveliness of virtue; but all from an effort to prove that there can be no reconciliation to God, until all the relics of sin and imperfection are entirely banished from the heart, and with the design of urging the sinner to vain attempts to form within himself a perfect righteousness of his own, that will deserve the approbation of God. But, alas! Satan is willing that God should be praised and righteousness exalted on such terms as these,—terms expressly adapted to turn the attention of the sinner from the cross of Christ, his only hope of salvation. For such a purpose, Satan himself would be willing to assume the form of an angel of light, and sing the praises of virtue. The work of Osorio drew forth a most triumphant reply from John Fox, one of the champions of the English Reformation.† The points of controversy between the Jesuit and the Reformer may best be exhibited by a few extracts from this extraordinary work:

"Osorio defines righteousness, that 'it is a state of soul founded on the law of God.' Andradius, also, says, 'Righteousness is an immoveable equity and government of mind, which measures all its actions and counsels by the law of God.' Herein is your error—for if there is no way of entering into the kingdom of God but by righteousness, and no righteousness according to your opinion can consist but of a perfect obedience of the divine law and dignity of works, what follows then? You must either deny that we are sinners in this life, and assert that we are righteous by works, or if, according to Scripture, you confess us

* *Apologia Confessionis De dilectione et impletione legis.*

† The work of Fox is contained in one of the volumes of the British Reformers, published by the English Religious Tract Society.

to be sinners, you must despoil us of all righteousness and shut us out of the kingdom of God. And what will you say to Augustine, who esteems all the righteousness in this life as dung? What will you say to Isaiah, who says it is as a defiled cloth? What will you say to Paul, who accounted it as loss? What will you say to Christ, who calls them that acquit themselves most righteously, not only servants, but, also, unprofitable servants? What will you say, if the most holy performances and endeavors, undertaken in whatever manner by the most perfect men in this corrupted nature, are so unprofitable to the immortality of life, that they are rejected by Christ as without profit; yea, that are despised and utterly contemned in the sight of God, like a filthy cloth, as the prophet Isaiah witnesseth, unless they are under-propped with better grace and the commendation of faith? . . . Now we are not against the deserved praises of righteousness. Be it so. But where shall we find this righteousness? Tell me in what country this man of righteous life dwells, who will so direct his life according to this idea of virtue proposed by you, that he fails nowhere? Who roots out all manner of wickedness? Who refrains from all railing with his tongue, suppresses the haughtiness, insolence and madness of an ambitious spirit, and the rashness of a headstrong mind? Who crucifies the flesh with the lusts? Where will that man be found, who performs all the duties of true piety, and so performs them that nothing is unequal in his duties, nor defective in his manners? He may be found in the books of Osorio, but not in the life, in the daily confessions or in the holy absolutions of Osorio. There was of old, I confess, the image of this most perfect righteousness; but that Phenix hath long since left the earth and departed hence to heaven, and now sits on the right hand of the Majesty, drawing all to himself; and I wish that, at length, he may also draw Osorio. To speak in one word, all the antiquity of former ages, the public consent of the former church, and the choicest writers out of all olden time, as many as ever rejected the ancient Pelagianism, all these with one mouth agree in this matter against you, that there is no integrity of righteousness in this life which is not imperfect, which needs not forgiveness; and that no one of all the saints has so lived, that a great deal was not wanting to him to complete righteousness, and who needed not daily to pray for the pardon of his iniquity."

Fox nowhere denies that man has all the natural faculties requisite for perfect obedience. He does not deny that it is within the power of God to render man perfect in this life, should he see proper to this end to exert his grace. But he asks, "Where hath he promised this?"

"Where hath God so engaged his faithfulness, that the remains of all sin being cut off, and all matter of the ancient contagion being blotted out, no relics of sin should remain in this life? There is nothing so difficult, but infinite Omnipotence can do it by a word, to whom it would not be difficult to restore this frailty of fallen nature to its ancient state of innocency, if he would. And there is no doubt but God would do it, if he had decreed to do as much by his secret counsel, as he could do by his infinite Majesty. Now, either prove that all infirmity of the flesh is taken away in the regenerate, and that they are

restored to their former innocency, which is without all sin, and also freed from a necessity of dying, or cease to dream of that perfection of righteousness in this life, which hitherto hath not been found in any of the saints, whether apostles, or patriarchs, or prophets."

Having examined many of the texts to which the Jesuit referred as proof that perfection is promised to the saints, the conclusion at which he arrives is, that these do contain the most positive assurance that all sin shall *ultimately* be removed from believers, but without the least intimation that this will take place in the present life. Christ, he says, takes away the sins of his people. But how? "He takes them away by removing the sins that were done; by helping that they may not be done; and by bringing to the future life, where they may not be done at all. Therefore, in this life there is only a race to the righteous; in the other life will be the prize." But the Jesuit says, "What! doth not Christ heal us, just as the brazen serpent healed the wounds of those that were hurt? And what are wounds, but sin? What is the healing of wounds, but the putting away of sins? What, then, shall the serpent be more powerful in fixing his sting, than Christ in taking it out? Shall Adam be more powerful to infect nature, than Christ to cleanse it? But how is nature purged, if yet the contagion of sin remains?" "I answer," says Fox, "not by denying, but by distinguishing." He then considers our condition in two respects, in relation to our guilt, and in relation to our moral disease. For our guilt, Christ has offered a perfect satisfaction upon the cross; and as to our disease, he has put us under a process of healing by the influences of the Holy Spirit. Christ does not suddenly cure us, but treats us after the example of the good Samaritan, who took the sick man, poured oil and wine into his wounds, mitigated his pains and grief, set his wounds to healing, and then left him to get well in the inn. So that in the end, not only will all our guilt be removed, but all our diseases will be healed.

We now leave the period of the Reformation. The views of Fox are the views which have been adopted by the reformed churches in general. About a century after Fox wrote, we hear Turretin defending the same views against Papists and Pelagians. Turretin was the successor and defender of John Calvin; and, in his day, was one of the most distinguished theologians of Europe. Indeed, we regard his system of theology as standing yet unrivalled, as to richness

of matter, piety of spirit, and general correctness of sentiment. Inasmuch, therefore, as his statement of the main question at issue must possess a high historical value, we here present it, though in a condensed form, to our readers :

"That the question may be rightly apprehended, be it remarked, we are not inquiring concerning the perfection of *sincerity*, which consists in serving God with a sincere and undivided heart. This was ascribed to Job (Job 1: 1), claimed by Hezekiah (Isaiah 38: 3), and ought to be found in every believer. We inquire not concerning that perfection which consists, subjectively, in the consecration of the whole man, soul and body, to the service of God (1 Thess. 5: 23), and, objectively, extends to all the commands of the law. Luke 1: 6 (*De perfectione partium, tam subjectiva tam objectiva*). This, also, is expected of every believer. [No good man, however imperfect must be all his actions, could make a reserve of either soul or body, or allow himself in the neglect of any divine command.] Nor concerning a *comparative* perfection, which may be ascribed to those who have advanced in faith and piety beyond such as are still occupied with the rudiments of religion, and need to be fed with milk (1 Cor. 2: 6. Phil. 3: 15. Heb. 5: 13). Nor concerning *evangelical* perfection, which covers all our imperfections with the garment of Christ's righteousness, in whom we are said to be perfect (Col. 2: 10). All these kinds of perfection we acknowledge. But our inquiry relates to a *legal* perfection—a perfection absolutely complete in every respect, to which there is nothing wanting, either as to extent or degree.

"We do not inquire whether such an attainment is *utterly* and *absolutely impossible*, as a thing is said to be impossible, which implies a contradiction in terms, or is repugnant to the nature of God, and is unsuitable to any condition of man. For in this sense we do not maintain that obedience to the commands of God is impossible to man; because it has been possible in a state of nature, it would be possible in a regenerate state, should God impart the requisite grace to remove all corruption from the heart; and it will be possible in a state of glory. But we speak of an impossibility in a restricted sense, and relatively to our present condition and to the plan of God; who, though he is able, has, for the wisest reasons, not seen proper to grant us perfect sanctification here. There is no question whether the works of the righteous are truly good works; but, are they so perfect as to meet the requirements of the law, so that the law has nothing to reprove? In fine, can the believer so promote his own sanctification, as to attain perfection both as to parts and as to degree, so as to fulfil the law not merely in an evangelical, but in a legal sense; so as to live, not only without crime, but without sin; so that the law could find in him nothing either to accuse or condemn, should God call him to judgment? This our adversaries affirm, but we deny."*

Turretin here expresses his views on two points of the greatest importance in this controversy. He teaches us what kind of perfection it is which is the subject of dispute, and what kind of impossibility there is in attaining it. Nothing

* De perfectione sanctificationis. Questio secunda.

short of the legal perfection which he here speaks of can be perfect sanctification. It is clear, however, that he did not consider this as absolutely and in every sense unattainable. Indeed, we know not that this has ever been asserted by any distinguished writer, from the days of Augustine down to the present time. And, although Bernard, Jansenius, Melancthon, Fox, Turretin, and others, employ the term *impossible* with reference to the fulfilment of the law, they nowhere maintain that there is any impossibility in the way of fulfilling the whole law, which can form the least excuse for the sinner; or any, which does not arise from the criminal depravity of our own hearts. Yet owing to this depravity, they supposed it might be said in a very important sense, that the attainment of perfect holiness in the present life is impossible. Turretin here clearly states the modified sense in which this phraseology is to be understood.

Since the time of the Reformation, the Society of Friends and the Wesleyan Methodists are the principal sects which have favored the doctrine of perfection. Our limits will not allow us to enter particularly into their views. It would seem, however, that neither of these sects advocated a perfection which excludes all depravity and vicious propensities. Barclay, a distinguished writer of the Society of Friends, in answer to an objection to his views, from 1 John 1: 8, "If we say we have no sin," &c., replies, "Sin may be taken for the seed of sin, which may be in those who are redeemed from actual sinning; but, as to the temptations and provocations proceeding from this, being resisted by the servants of God, and not yielded to, they are the devil's sin, who tempteth, and not the man's, who is preserved." John Wesley, at one time, considered it as almost the special vocation of his sect to explain and inculcate the doctrine of perfection; but it subsequently became the bane of his own ministerial enjoyment; he had too much discrimination not to observe many obvious defects in those who claimed to be perfect; he was frequently, also, perplexed in his attempts to solve the difficulties of anxious minds, and especially of conscientious females, who had piety enough to strive for perfection, but honesty enough to confess that it eluded their grasp. After all his rules, prescriptions, and spiritual counsels, he still could not dispossess them of depraved hearts. Hence, he was often compelled to admit, that he did not profess to

"preach a perfection, which was not consistent with a thousand nervous disorders." "Thus, he found himself preaching," as his biographer remarks, "of a sanctification which left the subject liable to sin, of an assurance which was not assured, and of an imperfect perfection."

We pass to a brief notice of the controversy in relation to this doctrine in our own times. It is not necessary to detail the particulars of its origin and progress. We need say nothing of the men, through whose instrumentality it has been revived; they are better known to the public than to the writer of this article. It would require but little charity, connected with some knowledge of the infirmities of human nature, to conceive of them as actuated by the purest of motives; yet, it requires but little acquaintance with the philosophy of the human mind, and with the word of God, to perceive that their published views are founded upon a baseless theory of metaphysics, and upon the most fallacious principles of Biblical exegesis. Perhaps, however, we ought not to flatter ourselves that we understand these views in every respect; since some of our wisest theologians are accused of misunderstanding, or of wilfully perverting them. But we leave those who do understand them to compare them with the views of Pelagius, as presented in this article. Doubtless, the advocates of perfectionism will not deny that they have adopted, in the main, the Pelagian scheme. Some additions there may be, but surely no improvement. We do not intimate by this, that they call any man master; they may be allowed the honor of entire originality; for there are cycles in human thought, as well as in the planetary system; opinions rise and set, as the stars; and when the circling years bring round old errors, there are always congenial minds to which they will present themselves, as bearing all the characteristics of original and far-reaching thought. Perfectionism is again to have its day; and we regret to find that, in certain sections, its baneful influences are already visible, so much so as to strengthen the natural apprehension, that the evil consequences which have hitherto attended this doctrine are destined to attend it still.

Among the most plausible arguments by which it is advocated, are the following: Perfect obedience to the law is our duty; provision is made in the gospel for the attainment of perfect sanctification. This is, also, promised to believers,

in the present life ; it is made our duty to pray for it, and many have attained it.

These arguments have been answered by able articles in the Biblical Repository, the Princeton Review, and other periodicals. It is admitted, on all hands, that the law is the standard of duty, and that we are under obligations to obey it, and should pray for grace that we may do so ; that the provisions of the gospel are amply sufficient for the removal of all sin from the people of God ; and, that, if God should apply them for this purpose, all sin might be removed even in the present life. It is admitted, that we have natural faculties, adequate to a perfect obedience to the whole law. Hence, some have admitted that perfect holiness is attainable. But it has been shown, conclusively, that all this does not prove that perfection will ever be actually attained in the present life ; and that all the passages of Scripture adduced to prove this, have been strangely perverted. Some are unwilling to employ the phraseology, "*perfection is attainable*," though they may not differ in sentiment from those who adopt such terms. Most assuredly, the Reformers employed, in general, very different language ; they were accustomed to say, "*perfection is not attainable ; it is impossible*," &c. Yet, they would, one and all, unhesitatingly admit, that, so far as it relates to our natural faculties, the provisions of grace, and the power of God, perfection in the highest sense is attainable in the present life. This we suppose to be the sense in which it is admitted, in the articles above alluded to ; at least, this is the only sense in which we can concur in such an admission. This differs but little from the sense in which it is admitted by Turretin. For perfection to be attainable in this sense furnishes no sufficient reason to believe that it ever has been attained in the present life, and no ground to expect that it ever will be. In order to the proof of this, there is still wanting one grand desideratum. It must be shown, that it is God's revealed purpose to exert his power and apply his grace for the perfect sanctification of his people in the present life. For, notwithstanding man's natural ability and the ample provisions of the gospel, there is still a moral inability—the remains of a corrupt and sinful propensity—which cannot consist with entire sanctification, and which can be removed only by the power of God. But the revelation of such a purpose, it is believed, cannot be made out

from the word of God upon any correct principles of exegesis. The perfectionists are by no means satisfied with the above admission, and seem extremely impatient with their opponents, that they do not utterly deny that perfection is attainable, justly supposing that they virtually do this, by admitting that it is attainable only in a sense that furnishes no reason to believe that it ever has been, or ever will be attained.

Our limits will permit us to proceed no farther in relation to the present state of the controversy. In order to express fully our own views, it would be necessary to notice more particularly the metaphysical theory and the false construction of the sacred Scriptures, upon which perfectionism is made to rest. All that we have attempted at present is, to let *history speak* upon this important subject. We have seen that the evangelical church has uniformly, with very few exceptions, concurred in the sentiment that perfection is not to be attained in the present life. Why God has not seen proper to grant to any of his people entire sanctification here, is best known to his own unsearchable wisdom. There have not been wanting those who have undertaken to assign the reasons for this. Ridgely has given us a long chapter upon this subject; but his reasons, however weighty and important, may not be God's reasons. These we can know only when, in the exercise of his adorable sovereignty, he shall see proper to reveal them. This he has no where as yet done. "Why it is," says Augustine, "I know not; for who hath known the mind of the Lord? Yet, I know not a little when I know, whatsoever that cause is, it is not the iniquity of a just God, nor the insufficiency of an almighty God." Says Turretin, "it is for the wisest reasons, that he might make a distinction between earth and heaven, between the church militant and the church triumphant, between the way and the country to which it leads." Let these general considerations satisfy our minds; nor let us pry into the counsels of God in such a manner as to divert us from our own duty, to foster a spirit of cavilling, and prevent our growth in grace. Let us pray and watch against dangerous and delusive errors. Especially, let us guard against that flattering and false persuasion of our own perfection, which blinds us to our guilt, and prevents the daily confession of sin. Let us watch and pray against every encroachment of temptation and sin. What profane trifling it is with a most sacred duty, to say, If *our*

notions of perfection are not true, if perfection is not to be obtained in the present life, it is idle and wrong to pray against *all sin*! How fond must we be of our own opinions, to be willing to make the authority of our Lord stand or fall with them! Is this modest? is this perfection? No, brethren, whatever may become of our little conceits and dogmas, let us still cleave to Jesus as our unerring guide, and let us not hesitate to adopt, without the least amendment, the prayer which he puts into our mouths. This requires us to pray to be delivered from all evil, and, at the same time, requires a daily confession of sin, and a daily petition for pardon. Let not a false philosophy discourage us from giving expression to what must be the promptings of every pious heart. We pray to be freed from all sin, because nothing short of this can fill our souls' desire; nothing short of this can express our cordial reconciliation to the whole law of God. It is thus, we expect to obtain strength to resist all sin. It is thus, we expect to grow in grace, and through grace to obtain the ultimate victory.

The doctrine of perfection lays high claim to consideration on account of the encouragement it affords us to strive after holiness. It is said to furnish the Christian with a definite object at which to aim, and encourages the confident expectation of attaining it. But be assured, the common doctrine has the decided advantage, even in this respect. Does it not hold up to the mind of the Christian the same God to be revered and worshipped, and the same law to be obeyed? Or, rather a holier God, and a more inflexible and holy law? Why, then, say that it presents no definite object to the mind? Does it not, also, hold out the encouragement, that constant progress in holiness during the whole of the present life, is not only possible, but may actually be realized by the Christian? Does perfectionism promise more than this? Does it fix a boundary which cannot be passed? Does it not say that even the perfect man may still make higher attainments? But one great advantage which the common doctrine has over the other, consists in the aid to holy attainment which it furnishes the soul, through the means of godly sorrow. He who asks how this can be, has never understood the philosophy of true penitence; he has yet to learn that perfection is to be reached through the lowly paths of humility, and not through the highway of an arrogant presump-

tion. One melting season of heartfelt, penitential sorrow is to the pious soul, what a refreshing shower is to the new-mown grass ; when the cloud that has emptied itself is withdrawn, the sunshine of holy joy succeeds, the soul takes fresh courage, and receives a new impulse in her efforts for holiness. What then must be the influence of a doctrine which shuts out penitence from the heart, and substitutes in its stead a delusive fancy, that there is no more sin to be forgiven ?

Another advantage of the common doctrine consists in the perfect peace which it affords, immediately upon the exercise of faith. The believer sees in Christ a righteousness commensurate with the demands of the law ; he accepts of his atonement and mediation, God is reconciled, and the liberated soul is now in the most favorable circumstances to make attainments in personal holiness. And when the believer finds himself baffled by the tempter, and that even his best efforts fall far short of perfection, he recurs to Christ and his righteousness ; he hears the cheering promise, " As I live, ye shall live also," and his courage is renewed. But perfectionism teaches the discouraging doctrine, that there is no perfect peace, no perfect reconciliation, without a perfect fulfilment of the law ; that notwithstanding all Christ has done, and all that faith can do, God can still be perfectly reconciled only upon the old legal ground of a perfect obedience. Perfectionists find it not necessary to recur to Christ constantly and every moment for comfort ; their settled and perfect peace flows from their own supposed attainments—attainments which make the mediation of Christ no longer necessary. Christ is exalted, a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins ; but, lo ! here is an Israel, needing no more repentance, no more remission. Christ can now be dismissed from their service, this part of his office, at least, being no longer required. May God protect his church, and the numerous young converts now thronging her gates, from this dangerous delusion ! Let us, as believers in Christ, cleave to the doctrine of perfect justification, perfect reconciliation, and perfect peace by faith. Let us keep an eye upon the promise, and patiently wait for the crown of righteousness, reserved for us in heaven. It is there we shall be arrayed in white garments ; it is there we shall bear palms in our hands, the emblems of victory ; it is there alone, that we shall find ourselves among *the spirits of the just made perfect*.

J. S. M.

ARTICLE V.

OBJECT OF THE WRITERS OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

AMONG the interesting topics of discussion in the department of Biblical literature, the aim of the several writers of the gospel history holds a prominent place. Each one of the four evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, had a definite purpose in undertaking a narrative of the life of Christ. Some of them formally announce their design; in the rest, we are left to infer it from the internal character of the books themselves. To this main design, doubtless, every part of each narrative is made to contribute. The events are narrated which conduce to the ultimate purpose of the several authors. In a history of an event where many accompanying circumstances are involved, we shall, perhaps, find that, while some of them are introduced for the sake of verisimilitude, like the back-ground in a painting, others are chosen for the connection which they are seen to have with the author's chief end. And, when some events of a striking character are omitted, it is not because they were unknown to the evangelist; but, because they were less relevant to the purpose contemplated by him in undertaking his narrative. Hence, we perceive that the different selection of events by the several writers is to be accounted for by a reference to the different design of each in the work written by him. Matthew wrote with a different aim from Luke; and Luke, with a different aim from John. The latter, therefore, is not to be regarded as simply expletive of the former, as if he designed only to record that which had been omitted by the others; but as having selected the conversations and narratives of events which he has preserved, without reference to what others had written or had omitted to write; because they were suited to another main end, which he designed to accomplish. Thus the four gospels are not to be viewed as a mere quadruple statement of the same circumstances. On the contrary, though each confirms every other, each was written for a separate purpose; each bears testimony to a separate aspect of the truths recorded. Hence, the gospels

are not to be viewed as a narrative merely. We are accustomed to regard them as such. But they are more. They are an argument. Of the gospels of Matthew and John, this is especially true. They both set out with a point to be proved concerning Christ. The writers propose, to furnish, from materials in their possession, a demonstration respecting the character of the Lord Jesus. They both announce their object, too distinctly to be misunderstood. Each chooses his own point to be proved. They pursue their object to the end. They both select those acts and conversations of our Lord, which affect their several arguments. They often mention with but slight notice those incidents of an event which are of little consequence to their main purpose; and often pass them over altogether. But to him who understands their aim, it is evident that all the parts of their narratives are constructed with reference to it. It is on account of the intense interest with which they aspire to their main end, bending their whole attention towards it, that occasional discrepancies are discovered in their statements. They are so much occupied with that which is principal and vital, that they overlook, at times, that which is merely incidental, and subsidiary, and unimportant. Having ascertained that which is essential to their purpose, in a given occurrence, they are not anxious, in every case, to inquire into all the adjuncts. Or, having related that which is important to their argument, they omit the rest, or seem to confound it, in some of its parts, with some other occurrence; so that we are in doubt concerning the identity of a fact stated by two different evangelists; or, perhaps, on the other hand, we labor to condense into one narrative, that which the sacred writers have given us as two or more. Specimens of the kind here described will immediately recur to the mind of the Biblical student. We indicate only the following—Luke 7: 36—50, compared with Matthew 26: 6—13, and John 11: 1, 2; 12: 3—8. Matthew 9: 18, compared with Mark 5: 23. Matthew 8: 28, compared with Luke 8: 27. Matthew 20: 30, compared with Luke 18: 35. Matthew 28: 2, compared with Luke 24: 4. Matthew 24: 44, compared with Luke 23: 39—43.

It is greatly for our interest to ascertain the object of each of the evangelists in writing his gospel. It is more than a mere amusing speculation. It is important as furnishing a

key for the explanation of many things, which are otherwise obscure. The settlement of this question will pour at once a flood of light upon the New Testament narratives. It will enable us, in our interpretations, to stand on new, and more solid ground. It will open before us the wonders of a new world. The gospels, always precious, it will invest with a new charm. It will spread them out as a close argument, ingeniously and abundantly sustained; thus presenting them under a new aspect before the intellectual and refined. The effort to understand the object of the writers will make us more familiar with the internal structure of the books. It will lead us to examine carefully minute points; and, in that process, we shall find a burden of richness and significance, and items of valuable instruction, in passages such as formerly awakened in us no interest. Here, too, we shall meet an inlet to the fields of early ecclesiastical history. We shall learn what errors first sprang up, to mar the purity of the apostolical churches. We shall find the ancient arguments of inspired men, which are as well suited to combat heresy now, as they were in the first century. Besides, light may be thrown on the great subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, in the course of such an investigation. We shall learn what aid, derived from existing documents, is consistent with writing under the impulse of the Holy Ghost; and whether men, thus "borne on" (*ὁπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*), may in any degree exercise the right of private judgment; or, in the use of their voluntary powers, choose what they will communicate, what they will omit, what they will adapt to their purpose, and at what point they will aim in their compositions.

It is the design of the present article to offer some contributions towards ascertaining the object of the writers of the gospels, and to exhibit the manner in which their object has been carried out.

There are various sources from which the object of the evangelists is to be sought. We may infer their design from the circumstances of the disciples, for whose sake the gospels were written; from the peculiar mental characteristics of each author; from the character of the age in which they wrote, and the length of time which had elapsed, since the events which they record had transpired; from the corruptions of Christianity which had sprung up, and of which the evan-

gelical authors might be expected to present a refutation ; and, especially, from an examination of the structure and the internal character of the gospels respectively. From the gospels which were written first, we may, also, obtain some light concerning the design of those which were written afterwards, successively. From each of these considerations testimony may be derived, which, when presented together, will furnish a view of sufficient clearness to produce entire conviction ; and lead to conclusions which cannot easily be resisted. A few remarks will be offered under each of these suggestions.

The circumstances of the disciples and others for whom the gospels were prepared, at the period in which each of them was written, will guide us in ascertaining the design of the several writers. The four gospels were not all written at one time, but at different periods. They were not all written for one class of persons, or for persons in one state, or one form of relations, or in one condition of necessity. Matthew is supposed by some to have written his gospel as early as in the year A. D. 37 or 38 ; Dr. Clarke puts it in A. D. 41. Rosenmueller, also, says, "the Fathers of the church agree with great unanimity, that he wrote eight years after the ascension of Christ. But from the passages 23 : 35, 27 : 8, 28 : 15, Hug fixes its date on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place more than thirty years later. In the arguments favoring this view, Eichhorn, also, concurs. Luke wrote in the year A. D. 63 or 64 ; Mark between A. D. 60 and A. D. 65 ; and the apostle John, in the course of his exile on the isle of Patmos. As Matthew was the first who collected the testimonies concerning Christ into a regular narrative, he must be supposed to have been governed by the condition of the persons for whom he wrote. He wrote for persons who were scattered abroad in various parts of Judea, and in the heathen world. The scenes which occurred in the life of Christ, and the event of his death, together with the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, had been the means of making disciples, who were widely separated one from another. Within the space of four or five years after the ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ, the history of his miracles and of his life, passing from country to country, and from mouth to mouth, must have become mingled with much that was erroneous. Partial and imperfect views were,

probably, diffused. Much of the extravagance of fiction might have been joined with the truth, and so have passed for truth. Confused accounts were likely to be given of events, which had become mixed and compounded with other and similar ones. The number of eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, who had been with Christ, and who had seen his miracles and heard his instructions, was made smaller by death. Some sudden persecution might be roused against the Christians, and sweep off the remnant of them from the earth at a stroke. None could tell how heavily the blow might descend; nor how extensive the slaughter which the imperial, Pagan sword might demand. Anxious that an accurate memorial might exist of the wonderful personage whom he had seen, and known, and in whom rested his hopes of everlasting life, Matthew determined, while the events were still fresh in his memory, and the argument was still clear in his head, and warm in his heart, and glowing upon his tongue, to commit to parchment that which might instruct and comfort his fellow-disciples, and convince those who were disposed to doubt, whether Jesus was the true Messiah. Perhaps, saved from the ravages of Roman indignation, it might escape to tell the amazing story, after the head that dictated, and the hand that wrote it, should be in the dust; and proclaim in distant and unknown lands the message of pardon, through the crucified and risen Saviour. These views are confirmed by the particularity of the gospel in stating events, and circumstances, and places, that the things spoken of might be examined, and confirmed or refuted. An additional confirmation of them is found in the fact, that Matthew occasionally strikes off from his main point to record instructions given by Christ, which he thought would be valuable to his scattered and persecuted brethren, should they ever fall into their hands. An example of this is found in the close of his gospel (28: 19, 20), where, though it was by no means essential to his main purpose, as will hereafter be shown, he presents the commission of the Lord to his apostles,—“Go ye, into all the world, etc.”; that the authority of the preachers of the word might be understood and acknowledged; and adds the promise which was designed to sustain them till the end of time: “Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” He had already completed his argument. This part of the account was by

no means essential to it. But he chose to append it, as a part of the history of the acts and sayings of Christ; the previous narrative and argument imparting immense value and weight to the authority which was thus given to the apostles.

Matthew wrote, also, for Jews. This fact lies on the face of his gospel, and is too evident to call for argument. One of the proofs of it is, that he perpetually appeals to the Hebrew Scriptures, as writings whose authority no one would attempt to question, and whose prophecies *must be* fulfilled. But it was only a Jew who would accord such authority to the Old Testament Scriptures. How could a Gentile understand the declaration that the Scripture "must be fulfilled?" This reference to the prophetic Scriptures occurs many times, in the course of the book. The fulfilment of prophecy was even represented as one of the ends of Christ's death. It was one of the ends of his death, as truly as was the redemption of the world. For, in referring to his sufferings, Christ himself, in supposing for a moment that his exemption from them were possible, immediately inquires, "How, then, shall the Scriptures be fulfilled?" But such an argument could find its weight, in that age, only in appealing to a Jewish understanding. Besides, he commenced his gospel with a genealogy of Christ, a Jewish register being called in as a witness to testify to the descent and family stock of a person, whose character and claims were to be settled, and his identity to be ascertained with the Messiah, who was the subject of prophecy in the Old Testament Scriptures. Again, Matthew takes no pains to explain Jewish customs, like Mark; or to describe the geographical situation of places incidentally mentioned, like Luke. He supposes his readers familiar with the customs alluded to, and with the position of the places which were the theatre of the travels and labors of our Lord; another proof, that the persons for whom his gospel was designed were Jews. Mark, on the contrary, wrote for Gentiles. Hence, it is that he explains the meaning of words which had acquired, in Jewish usage, a technical sense; and describes customs, which, as they were peculiar to the Jews, the Gentiles, for whom he wrote, might be supposed not to understand. Thus, he says (2: 18), "The disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast." In 7: 2, 3, he first defines the term "defiled," as meaning "un-

washen" hands ; because the Gentiles would not, otherwise have understood the technical meaning of *κοινὰς χεῖρας* to be *ἀνιπτοις* ; and afterwards, in order to make the reason of such a definition intelligible, he adds, "For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the traditions of the elders." In 12 : 42, he reduces the Jewish money, which the poor widow threw into the treasury, to the common Roman coin, which was of corresponding value. Luke wrote for the information of a certain individual, not acquainted with Palestine, an orderly narrative of the events connected with the history of Christ, from the beginning. That he was not acquainted with Palestine appears from the fact, that Luke perpetually introduces remarks, especially concerning the geographical position of places, of which a Jew or one who had been in the Jews' country, could not easily be supposed to be ignorant. Thus, he speaks of Nazareth, as a city in Galilee (1 : 26), and the same of Capernaum (4 : 31). He describes, also, the distance from Emmaus to Jerusalem (24 : 13), as sixty stadia ; and says that Mount Olivet was a Sabbath day's journey distant from the capital. John wrote at a much later period than the other evangelists. The Christian system had become known far more widely than in the days of Matthew or Mark. The simplicity of the faith had, also, become corrupted, and error and heresy had crept into the churches. The traditions of men had begun to assume a place among the doctrines of God. Eastern philosophy had intruded its dogmas among the simple truths of revelation ; perhaps, with the design of seeming to adopt its mysteries, and thus to make the Lord Jesus, ostensibly, the apostle and promulgator of the system ; perhaps, with the design of explaining the mysteries of the gospel,—yet in such a manner that the preaching of Christ should be in fact only the preaching of that peculiar form of philosophy, with which, by some wonderful statements of incomprehensible truths, it seemed to harmonize. And it was necessary for that aged disciple to stem the current of error by an argument adapted to the times. The church, scattered abroad, perhaps bewildered, in that early age, by the plausible stories which professed a divine origin, rightly looked to him, the only survivor of the twelve, to show what was truth. That the gospel of John was designed to meet such a state of things in the church and the world is evident

from its internal structure. There are not wanting those who have thought that they could discover in it an intimation of the state of theology and philosophy at the period in which it was written ; and a distinct design, on the part of the author, to refute error and to establish scriptural truth. And even if, on a careful examination, we are not prepared to allow so much as this, still we cannot deny that the gospel and the epistles of John are wonderfully adapted to a period distinguished by the prevalence of certain erroneous views.

There was a necessity, therefore, for the gospels, and a separate necessity for each. The peculiarity of the necessity fixed the character of each of them, because the character of each is according to the necessity which gave birth to it. One wrote for Jews ; perhaps, especially, for Jewish unbelievers ; another wrote for Gentiles ; the third for the information of a distant friend and magistrate, who had become interested to learn "in order" the things which Jesus did and taught. The fourth wrote both for worldly men and for followers of Christ, impelled by the necessity of the age and the state of public opinion just spoken of ; and, while he recorded the things which were most to his purpose, at the same time he presented that which was new and interesting and affecting, almost beyond any of the details of his predecessors. At the time when John wrote his gospel, Christianity had been carried to various parts of Europe and Asia, and into Africa ; perhaps, indeed, as Mosheim affirms, to the greater part of the known world. Among those to whom the gospel came, there were Jews as well as Gentiles ; and it was incumbent on him to write that which would produce conviction in both. Some were familiar with the prophecies of the Old Testament respecting Christ, and highly venerated them. Others had less knowledge of them, and less confidence in them ; perhaps others still had become advocates of a false philosophy, which they carried into their theology ; and it was necessary to break up their errors in both. Some of those for whom the evangelists wrote were living in a compact manner. They were crowded together in cities. They were often conversing together concerning the history of Christ. His acts were perfectly familiar to them. By the sweet and refreshing remembrance of the miracles and the words of their Lord and Master, they endeavored to strengthen and encourage themselves and one another against the day of trial. But others

were widely scattered asunder. They knew the facts of the gospel history only as they had been delivered from mouth to mouth by tradition ; and it was scarcely possible that in that form they should escape corruption, either by exaggeration or by omission, or by the intermingling of one with another, or by the unavoidable infusion, into the several statements, of the mental peculiarities or the partial views of those from whom the statements might come. Hence there was a necessity that the gospel histories should be written ; and the authors of them may be supposed to have been actuated by a design to meet this necessity.

We may seek for the design of the gospels in the mental characteristics of the several authors. In some of the evangelists, it is not difficult to determine what these were. We are let into their character and feelings, by means of sources extraneous to the gospels themselves. This is especially true of John. It is a statement having some truth also in respect to Luke. The epistles of the former, a different kind of writing from his history, make us familiar with the internal man. The book of the Acts, by the latter, gives occasional accounts of scenes in which Luke was himself an actor ; and hence we learn some things concerning him, which we should have known only dimly or not at all, if we had enjoyed only the reading of his gospel. But even the gospels themselves are not destitute of intimations of the peculiar characteristics of the authors. From the points which they undertake to prove, or the end which they evidently propose to themselves to accomplish, or from the method which they take to effect their purpose, we can conjecture what sort of persons they were. And from the knowledge of their main characteristics, light is thrown back by a reflex influence on the question, for what purpose did the evangelists write their gospels. The prevailing characteristic of John is perceived at once. It is a tender, gentle, loving spirit, directing to his theme, pervading all his work, guiding his selections, moulding his reasonings, forming his style, and lying at the basis of the whole. The statements presented by him are presented not simply as comporting with his main purpose ; but because, in addition to this, they harmonize with his own (loving) mind. Not only did the necessity of the age and of the state of opinions impel him in the choice of his subject ; but to write upon such a theme was congenial with a spirit like his. He was one of

those who are naturally drawn towards the perfect. He was fitted by nature to dwell upon the high, the sublime, the mysterious, the superhuman, in dignity, in rank, in office. The most elevated views of the character of Christ were most in keeping with his habitual contemplations. We think this is fully illustrated in his epistles and in the Apocalypse. And we should expect *a priori*, that, if the nature of the case would admit, such a man as John would have struck upon a view of the character of Christ, as the theme of his gospel, such as, in fact, we find him to have chosen. In Luke, we find a display of different characteristics. He was fitted to be an annalist. Though he was a true disciple, and had become imbued with the spirit of Christianity as really as any of his brethren, he lacked the enthusiasm, and was free from the excitability, which were evidently among the component features of the character of John. He entered upon the history of the life and the labors of Christ with a calm spirit, completely under control. He resolved not simply to give a collection of statements concerning the Saviour of the world, but to state the events in the order in which they occurred; and, by a thorough investigation, to assure himself of the authority of every portion of his narrative. This he himself tells us at the beginning; and his pledge seems to be well redeemed. The book of the Acts, written by him at a later period, is evidently the production of the same mind, tranquil, discerning, thorough, orderly, unprejudiced. The same characteristics of the author appear in the latter as in the former. We see in Matthew a disposition to reasoning and argument. Though an unlearned man, it is evident that he was not wholly undisciplined. He was familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures, and he understood them, and knew how to reason from them. He perceived what they demanded that the Messiah should be; and keeping in view this ground-principle through his whole book, he proceeds to prove that Jesus is the Messiah who was the subject of prophecy. He had skill to read the wants of those who were to be his readers. He perceived what they required. He perceived that there was one thing more suited to satisfy them, in an intellectual point of view, than any thing else. Hence he undertook, like a philosopher and an expert logician, to construct an argument of the kind which the exigencies of the case demanded. He resolved to what grounds he would appeal, and faithfully

carried out his purpose. He is swayed by no undue excitement, on one hand, nor drawn aside from his main end even by a desire for chronological accuracy, on the other. He is so absorbed in his object, that he urges on his way, using whatever facts are suited to his plan, till, having completely gone through with the life of the Messiah, he feels that the point proposed is proved; that he has arrived at the *quod erat demonstrandum*. Now the discovery of the peculiar mental characteristics of the several evangelists, it must be acknowledged, would not guide us with infallible certainty, to the design of their works. There is no reason, in the character of the man, why Luke should not have undertaken Matthew's argument. He might have been even more successful in it than Matthew was. Nor is there any reason why Matthew should not have attempted a chronological narrative like Luke; although, from his habit of grouping together events of a similar character, or conversations of the same general tenor, or parables aiming at the same sense, under the influence of an unusual susceptibility to the laws of association, we might be less certain that an author was entirely accurate, as to the order of time, than we are now. Instances of the kind alluded to occur in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Matthew's gospel, where he collects into one consecutive series, remarks of Christ, which, according to the other evangelists, were uttered at various times; and in the thirteenth chapter, where we have seven parables of our Lord, related as if they were all included in one conversation; but which Luke has put in different connections. There is no reason why Matthew or Luke should not have written the gospel of John; or why John should not have written the gospels of Luke or Matthew; although, from what is known of the character of John, in what channels his thoughts would be likely to run, we are sure that, had such a change taken place, each of the gospels would have been very different in manner from what we find them. The writers were all Jews. They were all familiar with the Jewish Scriptures; Matthew and John were eminently so. They might, therefore, have stood in one another's places. But if they had done so, each would have left the tinge of his own character upon his work. They would have baptized their narratives into their own spirit. The character of the works would have been in proportion to the character of the men. Yet, while a knowledge of the mental characteristics

of the different evangelists will not certainly guide us to the design of their works, it may serve to throw light on the works, in many of their details. We can also determine from it, negatively, that a given object would not be inconsistent with the character and spirit of the author,—an argument, which, as confirmatory of other and more substantial ones, is, by no means, to be contemned.

The design of the gospels is to be sought in the age, and the circumstances of the age in which they were written. And the circumstances of the age are to be learned partly from the gospels themselves, and partly from the civil or the ecclesiastical history of the age, preserved in other works. If the period in which the events were described was far removed from the period in which the events occurred, it would be necessary to record things, which, at an earlier date, would not be necessary. The laborers in the spiritual vineyard left, each his own mark, upon the period in which he labored. Hence a necessity would be created for the statement of one fact or of another, which otherwise might have been omitted. The views which had been propagated in the community would need confirmation and illustration. Errors were to be corrected. Prejudice was to be met, and its influence foiled. Circumstances which had been merely alluded to, as if they were universally known, in process of time would begin to fade from the public memory ; if not entirely, at least in some essential points. Customs might change, laws might relax their strictness, or, on the other hand, increase it. These things would all have their influence upon the authors of the gospels. They would have an influence, proportioned to the lateness of the period of their writing after the events related had transpired. They would influence both the object of the writers, and their manner. They would guide them in their selections. They would determine what things should be inserted, and what omitted. In the things which characterized the age and the circumstances of the age in which they wrote, therefore, we are to seek the design of their works. This point will be more fully brought to view hereafter.

Another source of information on this point is the corruptions of Christianity, which had already sprung up, and of which the gospels might be expected to contain a formal or an informal refutation. It is surprising that abuses in religion should have been introduced so early. We can account for

it only on two grounds ; one is the prevalence of comparative ignorance of true Christianity, as a spiritual system ; the other, the depravity of human nature. Heresies were beginning to be developed in different regions of country, and among different nations,—Jews and Gentiles. Some of them were the offspring of the Jewish religion,—the fruits of a system which appealed so much to outward form, that the worldly-minded and the ignorant might take the outward for the inward ; supposing that that which is visible in religion is the whole of religion. Others were a phase of heathenism. And still others were a compound of Jewish and pagan superstition united. Before the last of the gospels was written, possibly before the first (Matthew's), there were errors and abuses at Rome, in respect to the use of meats. There were heresiarchs at Galatia, who would mar the liberty of the gospel, by bringing the converts also under the law. There were crimes at Corinth, demanding the hand of discipline. There were Nicolaitans at Ephesus. There were Sadducees, and Nazarenes, and Ebionites in Judea. Cerinthus was a contemporary of the apostle John. The Gnostics had broached their peculiar doctrines, against which it was necessary that the Christians should be guarded. The theory of *Æons* was too well known, at least among a portion of the community, to be passed by without a definite or a tacit refutation. The Persian doctrine of a principle of good and of evil was exerting its influence among the people. Greek philosophy had thus early become guilty of corrupting the gospel of Christ. Matthew, residing in Palestine, among Jews, might be expected to meet the errors which prevailed in his region of country. John, dwelling with Greeks, and where Greek teachers and Greek philosophy were in all their glory, might be expected to direct his efforts, at least in some degree, against the errors with which the church of Ephesus, and the churches in Asia generally were surrounded. The Christian teachers were familiar with these errors. They could easily perceive the bad influence which they would exert upon the church ; that they would mar the simplicity of its doctrines ; corrupt its worship ; draw away attention from the demands of spiritual piety ; and introduce dissension and hostility among the brethren. The gospels which assumed the character of an argument were the proper place for the refutation of these errors ; not by a system of reasoning, but

by the statement of antagonist facts, suited to display and confirm the truth. An account of the leading features of these heresies will, we think, be sufficient to show that one of the evangelists at least, (John), designed to meet and rebut error, and to establish correct views; perhaps, indeed, that it was the main design of this evangelist, in undertaking his gospel, to combat mistaken notions which he saw beginning to prevail around him.

The doctrines of Cerinthus, the Nicolaitans, and others, to which we have alluded, might be safely merged in the general doctrines of the Gnostics, and described as part of the same; since, if they are not in truth the same heresy, they are branches from the same root. They are fruit from the same seed. Besides, the Christian fathers reduced under the general title of Gnosticism, whatever errors sought admittance during the first age of Christianity into the circle of gospel truths. For the sake of what follows, we give below a statement of the nature of the heresies which gave occasion, as we conceive, at least in part, for the narrative of John. The Gnostics derived their name from the Greek *γνώσις*, knowledge; as if in their sect were treasured up all true philosophical knowledge. To this system, very probably, Paul alludes in his epistle to Timothy (1 Tim. 6: 20), "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science (*τῆς γνώσεως*) falsely so called." And, still more evidently in Col. 2: 8, 9, "Beware lest any man spoil you, through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ; for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head (*πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*) bodily." See, also, in allusion to this subject, 1 Cor. 13: 8. Eph. 1: 23. 3: 19. Col. 1: 13—19. 2: 3, 18, 23.

"This name (Gnostics) was assumed by a religious philosophical sect, which combined the phantastic notions of the Oriental systems of religion with the ideas of the Greek philosophers, and the doctrines of Christianity. There were sages as early as the times of the apostles, who boasted of a deeper insight into the origin of the world, and of the evil in the world, than the human understanding, so long as it remains in equilibrium, can deem admissible, or even possible. Simon the magician, of whom Luke speaks in the Acts of the Apostles, was the first among them. Even in *his* dogmas, we discover the traces of ideas which were common to all the Gnostics; and they bear the unquestionable impression of an Oriental, particularly of a Persian and Chaldaic origin. They may be reduced to the following heads:—God, the highest

intelligence, dwells in the plenitude [πλήρωμα] of light, and is the source of all good; matter, the crude, chaotic mass of which all things were made, is, like God, eternal, and is the source of evil. From these two principles, before time commenced, emanated beings, called *æons*, which are described as divine spirits. The world and the human race were created out of matter by one *æon*, the demiurge, or, according to the later system of the Gnostics, by several *æons* and angels. The *æons* made the bodies and the sensual soul of man (*sensorium*, ψυχή) of this matter; hence the origin of evil in man. God gave man the rational soul; hence the constant struggle of reason with sense. What are called gods by men (for instance, Jehovah, the God of the Jews), they say are merely such *æons*, or creators, under whose dominion man became more and more wicked and miserable. To destroy the power of these creators, and to free man from the power of matter, God sent the most exalted of all *æons*, to which character Simon first made pretensions. He was followed in these pretensions by Menander, a Samaritan, the most celebrated of his scholars, who, towards the end of the first century, founded a sect at Antioch and Syria. Simon and Menander were enemies to Christianity. Cerinthus, a Jew, of whom John the evangelist seems to have had some knowledge, combined these reveries with the doctrines of Christianity, and maintained, that the most elevated *æon* sent by God for the salvation of man, was Christ, who had descended upon Jesus, a Jew, in the form of a dove, and through him revealed the doctrines of Christianity; but, before the crucifixion of Jesus, separated from him, and, at the resurrection of the dead, will again be united with him, and lay the foundation of a kingdom of the most perfect earthly felicity, to continue a thousand years. In the second century, during the reign of Adrian, and both the Antonines, these principles were adopted by the Christian philosophers, who are more particularly known under the name of *Gnostics*, and still further refined, extended and systematized. Saturninus, a Syrian, speaks of an unknown supreme God, who had generated many angels and powers; seven of these *æons* were, according to him, creators of the world, and soon fell from God; one of them, the God of the Jews, had seduced man to him; whence originated the difference between good and bad men. Saturninus also calls Christ the Saviour sent by God, and the Son of God; but the opinion that Christ was not actually born, and had not a real human body, but only an incorporeal image, is peculiar to him, on which account his followers and other later Gnostics, who agreed with him in this respect, were called *Docetæ* and *Phantasiasts*. Saturninus very consistently denied a resurrection of the body, and admitted only a return of the souls of good men into the being of the Godhead. His sect was distinguished by austerity of manners, by their abstinence from flesh, and by a rejection of matrimony.*

"It is not to be denied that according to the positive declarations of history, Cerinthus was a contemporary of the apostle, and abode in the region in which the latter taught and labored in the cause of the gospel; and that the heresy we have mentioned constituted a part of his system. At the same time, too, appeared the Nicolaitans, who caused much corruption in the churches, and called for all the vigilance of the apostle. In respect to this particular tenet, as well as many others, they coincided with Cerinthus.

* Encyclopædia Americana, Art. *Gnostics*.

"Even if we had no historical evidence as to this matter, if Irenæus, Jerome and Epiphane had not expressly mentioned Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans as heretics, whose influence John intended to counteract, still the authentic expression of his sentiments relative to certain heresies which is found in his first epistle, compared with the plan and contents of the gospel, and the general history of the time, would direct us to these persons, as certainly as definite historical information.

"That he might in some way accord to Jesus the distinction of a higher origin, which his actions clearly evinced, he asserted that one of the spiritual natures we have mentioned, namely, the Christ, united himself to Jesus in the form of a dove at his baptism. On this account he possessed henceforth the power of producing superhuman effects, and likewise of acquainting mankind with the true, eternal Deity, who had remained hitherto unknown to them, because he had not revealed himself by any operation.

"This Christ, as an immaterial being of exalted origin (*e superioribus Christus*), being one of the purer kinds of spirits, was from his nature not susceptible of material affections, of suffering and pain. He therefore at the commencement of the passion resumed his existence separately from Jesus, abandoned him to pain and death, and soared upwards to heaven, from whence he came. Cerinthus distinguished Jesus and Christ, Jesus and the Son of God, as beings of different nature and dignity.

"The Nicolaitans held similar doctrines in regard to the supreme Deity and his relation to mankind, and an inferior spirit, who was the creator of the world. Among the subaltern orders of spirits, they considered the most distinguished to be the only begotten, the *μονογενής*, (whose existence, however, had a beginning), and the *λόγος*, who was an immediate descendant of the only begotten. Christ belongs to the number of beings sprung from God; Jesus, however, is a son of the creator of the world, with whom Christ united himself at his baptism, and whom he abandoned at his passion."*

"An opinion has prevailed, derived from the authority of Clemens, the Alexandrian, that the first rise of the Gnostic sect is to be dated after the death of the apostles, and placed under the reign of the emperor Adrian; and it is also alleged, that, before this time, the church enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, undisturbed by dissensions, or sects of any kind. But the smallest degree of attention to the language of the Holy Scriptures, not to mention the authority of other ancient records, will prevent our adopting this groundless notion. For, from several passages of the sacred writings, it evidently appears, that even in the first century the general meeting of Christians was deserted, and separate assemblies formed in several places by persons infected with the Gnostic heresy.

"The notions of this sect concerning Jesus Christ were impious and extravagant. For, though they considered him as the son of the Supreme God, sent from the *pleroma*, or habitation of the everlasting Father, for the happiness of miserable mortals; yet they entertained unworthy ideas, both of his person and offices. They denied his deity, looking upon him as the son of God, and consequently inferior to the Father; and they rejected his humanity, upon the supposition that every thing concrete and corporeal is in itself, essentially and intrinsically

* Hug's Introduction, pp. 422, 423, Fosdick's Translation.

evil. From hence the greatest part of the Gnostics denied that Christ was clothed with a *real* body, or that he suffered *really*, for the sake of mankind, the pains and sorrows which he is said to have sustained, in the sacred history."*

It was by such errors that the early Christians were surrounded. Against such heresies, gradually creeping into the church, under the garb of Christianity, the apostles found it necessary to guard their brethren. John saw most of these heresies, and felt most the necessity of furnishing an antidote, because he lived till the last of the apostles. The seeds of false philosophy and theology germinated and grew up, during his life-time, giving promise of a baneful harvest. Divisions of opinion among the brethren were already manifested, and many antichrists had arisen. (See 1 John 2: 18, 19, 22, 23; 4: 1—3. 2 John 7, 10. 3 John 10.) And it was in part with the design to meet and rebut such errors, that some at least of the gospels were written. We have not only external proof of the existence of such heresies in the history of the times, but, as we cannot doubt, internal proof of it in the structure of the gospels themselves, and in the epistles. Hence the best source from which to learn the design of the authors is, the internal character of their works. Two of them distinctly state their object. The design of the others is not difficult to be inferred. As we have spoken so largely of John, we will present, first in order, the internal testimony concerning his object, drawn from an examination of the work itself.

The question, for what was each of the gospels written?—may receive additional light by a discussion of the subsidiary question, for whom were they written? The latter, therefore, will be involved in the former. In John 20: 31, we have the apostle's own announcement of his design,—“These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name.” The announcement affirms nothing of his purpose to refute error; but the carrying out of his plan includes and accomplishes it, by stating and confirming the truth, as well as by the use of expressions which, though they seem not to have any hidden meaning, yet are fitted, in a gentle and effectual manner, to secure the double end of reproving the false and establishing the true. In declaring his purpose

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. I, p. 33, Glasgow, 1828.

to be to prove "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," we take the apostle's meaning to be not simply, as Matthew's was, to show that Jesus was the Messiah, but also to show that, as the Messiah, he was possessed of divine dignity and power. He involves each of these points in the progress of his work. The former he proves in two ways; first, by proving his other point, namely, the divine dignity of Christ, and, secondly, by showing that the prophecies of the Old Testament, which refer to the Messiah, were fulfilled in him. Hence we find in several instances, as we do in the gospel of Matthew, a reference to some prophetic scripture, accompanied by the notice that it was fulfilled in Christ, e. g., "These things were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled. A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they have pierced." Ch. 19:36, 37. See also ch. 2:22. 5:39. 12:14—16, 37—41. 19:24, 28, 29, which are all examples of the same thing. Besides, he cites two instances in which Christ avowed himself the Messiah; once in his conversation with the woman of Samaria (4:25, 26), "I that speak unto thee am he;" and again in his interview with the blind man, who had been healed (9:35—38), "Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee." It is certain that in the words, "these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God," the evangelist designed to prove the divine character of Christ, absolutely; and, it can scarcely be doubted that it was also his purpose, in connection with this main object, to meet the errors of the prevailing sects. Irenæus affirms (Lib. III, adv. hæreses, c. 11) that John wrote his gospel for the purpose of opposing the errors of Cerinthus. And Rosenmueller remarks, "this opinion is not wholly without foundation. For if the views presented by Irenæus of the doctrines of Cerinthus be compared with the views entertained and propagated by Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, Basilides, Marcion, etc., concerning angels and æons, among which were *Χάρις*, *Ἀλήθεια*, *Μονογενής*, *Λόγος*, *Ζωή*, and their habitation (*πλήρωμα*), celestial space, also their opinion that the sufferings of Christ were apparent and not real, it seems not unlikely that John, by using phrases peculiar to them, designed to oppose their errors."*

* Tittman has written a treatise to show that we shall seek in vain for any traces of the Gnostics in the New Testament.

Storr supposes that the gospel of John was designed to refer to the sect of Sabians, or disciples of John the Baptist, and to correct the errors by which they were distinguished. The Sabians acknowledged John the Baptist as the author of their religion, whom they preferred to Christ, and exalted above all the prophets. Hug also agrees in this respect with Storr. He says:

"At the commencement of his book the evangelist gives great prominence to the assertion, that Jesus is *the light* and *the life* (1:4, 5, 9); and in the progress of his narrative, his attention is frequently, and according to his custom systematically, directed to these two positions, 3:19—22. 5:34, 35. 8:12. 9:5. 12:35, 36, and 46. 6:35 and 48. 6:51—60. 10:28. 9:25, 26. 14:6. 17:3.

"It would seem from his procedure in the selection of facts for his purpose, that the sacred writer had also in mind such persons as denied that Jesus was *the light* and *the life*, or, to speak without a figure, that he was the moral renovator and teacher of the world, to whom belonged the praise of having conducted them from their errors to the path of truth and happiness. There were several points which he was desirous of establishing; that Jesus was the Christ, that he was the Son of God, and that those who believed in him would have life through this discipleship (20:31).

"Nor is it difficult to conjecture the person to whom some gave precedence before our Lord, as the enlightener of the world and author of the doctrines which conferred life on man. It was John the Baptist. When at the outset of his book, the author announces the doctrine that *the Logos is the light which shineth in darkness*, he subjoins, *John came to bear witness of the light*. This is plain, and nothing more was necessary. But the writer feels a deep-rooted anxiety in regard to this point, and expressly repeats this declaration a second time, in an antithesis, and the first member of this antithesis again for the third time: "The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe." He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world (John 1:7, 8, 9).

"The evangelist has also selected discourses of Jesus which contain declarations of his superiority to John, and he introduces confessions of John himself, which state the pre-existence of Jesus, his unequalled dignity as a Teacher, and as the author of life and happiness to man, and his own inferiority, as being but a disciple and messenger (1:15. 1:20—31. 3:26—36. 5:34—37. 10:41.

We find, too, that in this region and in Ephesus, the city which the evangelist had selected for his residence, there were men in Nero's time, who did not know of any other baptism than John's, had become his disciples through it, and had heard nothing of the Holy Ghost; for Paul afterwards laid his hands on certain men of this description, and baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, imparting to them the

Holy Ghost, so that they spoke with tongues (Acts 19: 1—8). They were certainly not the only such persons of their time; and many may have been more pertinacious in their preference for their teacher, and less flexible in their opinions.

"To such, probably the evangelist had reference in introducing those passages which exhibit John as not daring to compare his baptism, viz., the baptism by water, with the baptism with water and with the Holy Ghost (1: 33. 3: 26—30). So likewise the observation in relation to the gifts of the Spirit (7: 39), which contains an explanation for those who were not, rather than those who were, believers; the exalted representation of regeneration by water and the Spirit (3: 3—12); and all that Jesus says respecting the Comforter and the Holy Ghost, which was to be poured out on his disciples after he was ascended to heaven (14: 16, 17. 14: 26. 15: 26. 16: 7—15)."

Henry remarks, "Some of the ancients say that John wrote this gospel at Ephesus, at the request of the ministers of the several churches of Asia, in opposition to the heresy of Cerinthus and the Ebionites, who held that our Lord was a mere man.

Professor Michaelis has espoused the opinion that John's gospel was written to confute the Gnostics and Sabians, and has advanced several arguments in its favor. The following are a specimen. The Gnostics placed the Word above all the other æons, and next to the Supreme Being; Cerinthus places the *only begotten* (μονογενής) first, and then the *Word* (Λόγος), as two separate æons. But John affirms that the "*only begotten*" and the "*Word*" are one (1: 14). "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father" (δόξαν ὡς, κ. τ. λ. to wit: the glory of, etc.) The Gnostics granted that the Word existed before the creation, but not from all eternity. John affirms the existence of the Word from all eternity (1: 1). The Gnostics admitted that the Word was an æon, and therefore a god, in a lower sense. John asserts "the word was God," or God was the Word,—God in the highest sense (Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος). The Gnostics maintained that the world was made by a malevolent being; John, on the contrary, that it was made by God. They regarded *Life* (ζωή) as a distinct æon from the Word. John asserts, "in him (the Word) was Life" (1: 4).

Tittman (*Meletemata sacra*) maintains that John wrote his gospel for the sake of the Jews, who denied that Jesus was

* Hug's Introduction, pp. 244, 245.

the Messiah, attacked his divinity, or in any wise cherished wrong opinions respecting him; and for the instruction and confirmation of Gentile Christians and others in the true doctrine of the Messiah,—an opinion which, in fact, embraces all that we have advanced.

Rosenmueller unites the opinions of all. His words are: "In my judgment there is no objection to the sentiment that John had special reference to those who had already propagated errors similar to those of the Gnostics (for false teachers and impostors of this sort are mentioned not only by John, in his epistles, but also by James, Peter, and Jude); perhaps, also, to the disciples of John the Baptist and their doctrines; and that, in addition to these ends, he embraced the present occasion to instruct both Jews and Christians more fully concerning the province and dignity of the Messiah;—and that thus the various opinions of the learned concerning the scope of the gospel of John may be conveniently united and reconciled."

It would swell this article beyond its proper limits, were we to enter into a full discussion of the phrase, *the Son of God*. It is sufficient for our present purpose to say, 1. that it is often equivalent, in the language of the evangelists, to the term, *the Messiah* (Mat. 4:3. 14:33. 27:43. Luke 4:3, 9. John 1:34. 6:69. 20:31. Acts 8:37. 9:20. See, also, Rom. 1:4. Heb. 7:3. 1 John 4:15. 5:5, 20), and 2. that the Jews accounted the assertion of Christ, "I am the Son of God," as an announcement of his title to divine dignity and honor; as the putting forth of a claim to divine authority; so that to show that Christ was the Messiah involved the proof also of his divinity (Mat. 26:63—66. Luke 22:69—71. John 5:18. 19:7, and especially 10:33, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God"), and 3. that Christ designed, in affirming that he was the Son of God, to claim the attributes and rights of divinity. (John 5:17, 21, 23). It may be added, that the terms Son of God and Messiah are used interchangeably in the New Testament, in several places. (1 John 5:5. Acts 13:33, etc.)

It remains only that we state again, as definitely as we can, the design of the other evangelists, and then briefly exhibit the manner in which the design of each is carried out.

It was the object of Matthew to show that Christ was the Messiah, to whom the prophecies of the Old Testament Scriptures refer. In the beginning of his gospel, he abounds in notices of the fulfilment of prophecy in him. Thus he affirms that prophecy was fulfilled in his miraculous conception and birth (1 : 22, 23), in his place of nativity (2 : 5, 6), in his early flight into Egypt (2 : 15), in the massacre of the infants of Bethlehem on his account (2 : 17, 18), in his removal to Nazareth (2 : 23), and in the appearance of John the Baptist, as his harbinger (3 : 3). Occasionally throughout his narrative, after having stated a particular event, he calls attention to the fact, that this event was another testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus, because a prophecy concerning the Messiah was fulfilled in it. Of this we have examples in his healing the sick (8 : 17) ; in his having John for his harbinger (11 : 10) ; in his mildness of character, and his avoidance of public observation (12 : 17—21) ; in his assurance that the days of his ministry were those to which prophets and kings had looked forward with intense desire (13 : 16, 17) ; in his announcement that the expected Elias had already come (17 : 10—12) ; in his humble, yet triumphant approach to Jerusalem, riding upon an ass (21 : 4, 5) ; in the intimation that he was the stone, rejected of the builders, which had become the head of the corner (21 : 42) ; that he was the subject of David's prophecy, "The Lord said unto my Lord," etc. (22 : 42—45) ; in the declaration that he was to be betrayed, "as it was written of him," (26 : 24) ; that his disciples were to be scattered from him (26 : 31) ; that, in the event of his escape, the Scriptures could not be fulfilled (26 : 54) ; that he was arrested and persecuted, after having been permitted for a considerable time to teach, unmolested (26 : 56) ; in the purchase of the potter's field with the thirty pieces of silver, which Judas had received, as the price of his betrayal of his Master (27 : 9, 10) ; and in the division of the clothing of Christ among those who crucified him (27 : 35). Where a distinct reference is not made to any prophecy fulfilled in a given event or collection of events, still the events narrated are of such a nature, as to accord with the character of the Messiah foretold by the prophets. Thus after having related several parables of Christ, Matthew makes the remark that his speaking in parables was in keeping with the predictions of the Old Testament concerning the Anointed

One (13 : 35.) Hug and Eichhorn, we have remarked, agree in saying that the gospel of Matthew was written just before the destruction of Jerusalem.* At this period, the whole nation, with raised expectation, were looking for the coming of the Messiah. This expectation encouraged the leaders of the people in the civil commotions which they were fomenting. But Matthew shows that their expectation was vain. The Messiah had already come. It was that Jesus, who had wrought so many wonderful works. This assurance must have been a grievous disappointment to the leaders of the insurgents; at the same time, its tendency must have been to quell the tumult, to convince the ignorant, and to confirm true Christians in their religious faith. Such being the object of Matthew, chronological accuracy was not a matter of importance with him. He did not undertake a history, but a historical argument; and he recorded facts as they came into his mind, for the simple reason that they suited his argument. Hence, also, we may suppose he omitted many things in the biography of Christ, which he perfectly well knew, and overlooked often some of the circumstances of an event, because they had no special bearing upon his main point; and, absorbed in his prominent object, he lost sight, as it were, of every thing else.

Mark was a very intimate friend of the apostle Peter. The latter speaks of him in one of his epistles under the endearing appellation, "my own son" (1 Pet. 5 : 13). The Christians were accustomed to assemble in his mother's house, and to that well-known place of prayer Peter bent his steps, immediately after he had been miraculously delivered from prison (Acts 12 : 12). From the passage 1 Peter 5 : 13, there is reason to suppose that, at the time when that epistle was written, Mark was with Peter. Indeed, it is generally understood that, in his gospel, he wrote as an amanuensis,

* The passage in Mat. 23 : 35 mentions "Zacharias, the son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the porch and the altar." This Zacharias was to be the last of a series of righteous persons, on whom the Jews had laid, or were yet to lay, violent hands. Christ speaks of him prophetically. He was to be slain after Christ. Christ was not the last. But Matthew throws in, as his own words, not the words of Christ, "whom ye slew between the porch and the altar,"—implying that the event was now already past; and fixing at a late period the date of the gospel. In 24 : 15, having quoted the words of Christ, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place," he adds his own words, "Whoso readeth, let him understand,"—implying that that event was already existing, and that he would have the Jews take warning, and "flee to the mountains." In the statement of the falsehood concerning the stealing of the body of Christ by his disciples (28 : 15), he says, "this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day"—as if a considerable period had elapsed. The same may be said of 27 : 8.

under Peter's dictation. At the time of writing his gospel, Mark was probably in Rome; and he wrote for the benefit of persons residing there, and familiar with the Latin language. That he was with Peter at Rome, and wrote his gospel there and for Romans, appears, first, from Peter's communication of the salutation of Mark, together with that of the church at Babylon (figuratively, for Rome, as John, in the Revelation, puts the one for the other), from that place to the scattered saints; secondly, because Eusebius informs us, from Papias and Clement of Alexandria, that St. Mark composed his gospel at the earnest request of St. Peter's hearers at Rome; and, as Bagster remarks, it is generally agreed that he wrote his gospel at Rome; and thirdly, from internal evidence. Many things, it is affirmed, are omitted, which were creditable to Peter; while, in the spirit of true humility, he caused Mark to record with the utmost fulness the account of his errors and failings. Again, in Mark 12:42, we have the Jewish coin, "a mite," reduced not into Greek, but into Latin money, its value being given in such a manner as to be intelligible to Roman readers. He also uses the Latin form *κεντυριον*, *centurio*, (15:39, 44, 45), for the commander of a hundred soldiers, where Matthew and Luke, in the corresponding account, use the pure Greek word *ἐκατόνταρχος* (Mat. 27:54. Luke 23:49). Mark is the only New Testament writer who uses *κεντυριον*. Another instance of this sort is his use of the Latin word *σπεκουλάτωρ*, 6:27 (executioner), instead of the Greek *δορυφόρος*, or something similar. A learned writer on the gospel of Mark says: "If Mark designed his gospel for the Romans, we see why he omitted many miracles of Christ and many brief narratives and conversations, and selected those things which would be most useful to those for whom he wrote, and which it was appropriate that he should relate to persons in such circumstances. Hence it was that he passed by many things, which are found in Matthew and Luke, pertaining to the Jews alone, and less interesting to persons living remote from Palestine; also things not necessary for Romans to know, or which were adapted to the Jewish mode of thinking; e. g., Mat. 16:2, 3. 19:28. Luke 4:16—30. 23:28—32. He was more sparing in his references to the Old Testament than Matthew and Luke. He added remarks for the sake of illustrating things which it was necessary for his readers to know, but which

would have been perfectly familiar to Jews. And, finally, he omitted the genealogy of Christ, which is given both by Matthew and Luke, because the Roman disciples, being Gentiles, would be satisfied to know simply that Christ was the only begotten Son of God; without caring to trace his descent from ancient families, by the help of Jewish registers." (Rosenmueller, *Scholia in Nov. Test.*, Tom. I, pp. 576, 577.) Had Mark designed his gospel for Jewish readers, he might have omitted many explanations contained in it, which were necessary for Gentiles, and especially for persons living so far from the scenes and customs of the Jews, as Italy is from Palestine. Thus it would have been superfluous to inform a Palestine Jew, that "the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast oft" (2: 18); or that "the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not" (7: 3, 4); he would have had no need to explain to such an one the meaning of the word *Corban* (7: 11), or to define *παρασκευῇ*, "the day before the Sabbath" (15: 42). But on the supposition of his writing for Romans, we see at once the reason of his particularity.

Mark relates but few events in the life of Christ which are not contained in the gospel of Matthew; perhaps only three; and these are recorded in chap. 1: 23. 8: 22—27. and 12: 41—44. There are besides a few verses of instruction and two parables. But he gives minute details concerning many occurrences, for which we look in vain in his predecessor; and changes the order of many acts and conversations of our Lord, which are related by Matthew. Of his greater particularity we may name, as examples, Mark 5: 2, as compared with Matthew 8: 28, and Mark 5: 13, compared with Matthew 8: 32; Mark 5: 22, compared with Matthew 9: 18; Mark 15: 7, compared with Matthew 27: 16. He is not, therefore, the epitomist of Matthew, as Augustine first suggested; but rather his critic and corrector.

We have said that it is generally understood that Mark wrote his gospel, as an amanuensis, under Peter's dictation. Justin Martyr refers to the gospel of Mark under the title of *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, or *Memoirs of Peter*. We have somewhere seen it spoken of as the *κήρυξις Πέτρον*, or *preaching of Peter*. The connection of Peter with Mark in the preparation of his narrative is not a mere matter of conjecture. The internal proof of it is perpetually recurring throughout the work.

Peter is repeatedly named as his voucher, on whom he depends, as an eye and ear-witness, for the information which he communicates. Often, when the narrative does not demand at all that Peter should be introduced by name, Mark seems to wish to bring the authority of his presence at any given event, in order, as it were, to substantiate it. Thus, in 1: 36, it is said that Peter followed Christ, as a witness of the things narrated. In the account of the restoration to life of the daughter of Jairus (5: 37), Peter is named as one of the three who were admitted to behold the miracle. In 9: 2, he is spoken of as one of the witnesses of the scene of the transfiguration. In 10: 28, the evangelist exhibits Peter as making a remark, which gave occasion to the subsequent instructions and encouragements. The same may be said of 11: 21. In 13: 3, Peter appears again as the witness and voucher of the prophetic conversation of Christ concerning the destruction of the city and temple. In 16: 7, is the command, "tell his disciples and Peter, etc.," which is equivalent to the assurance that Peter was, therefore, to be a special witness of the reality of Christ's resurrection.

We cannot enter, more at large, into the question of the sources of Mark's gospel. It is sufficient to say that he had the gospel of Matthew before him, and supposed his readers to be already acquainted with it. He designed, under the direction of Peter, to supply the deficiencies of some of its statements, and to arrange the whole in chronological order. Some incidents mentioned by Matthew he passes over entirely, some he condenses, some he corrects, and some he gives with additional particulars—and adapts the whole to Roman Christians.

Of the design of the gospel of Luke, and the manner in which that design is carried out, we need not now speak again. In the preface to his gospel, the first five verses of the first chapter, he states his object with explicitness. It is sufficient to say, that his plan is successfully followed to the end. He was, probably, not a Jew by birth, but a proselyte. For in Col. 4: 10, 11, Paul presents the salutations of certain persons, who, he says, were "of the circumcision;" and afterwards (verses 12—14) adds the salutation of several others, including Luke; implying that these latter were not of the circumcision, or were not Jews by birth. He is said by Theophylact to have been a native of Antioch. He was,

likewise, a physician (Col. 4 : 14). The writer just quoted remarks, "Some say, that he was, also, one of the seventy disciples of our Lord." (Luke 10 : 1 seq.) Perhaps it was on account of his being one of this body, that he alone of all the evangelists felt it incumbent on him to give an account of their appointment, instructions and success. He might have been allured from Antioch to Palestine, for the purpose of becoming more thoroughly acquainted with the religion which he had espoused. Possibly, as a medical man, he might have desired to study the diseases of that country and their modes of treatment. In view of his profession, his connection with the disciples was a most providential event. He was specially qualified to observe the cases of disease which were cured by our Lord ; and to testify to their reality, as well as to the miraculous cure ; and his testimony, as a man of scientific acquirements in this department, would have higher value in the eyes of skeptical readers, than that of uneducated fishermen. We find, indeed, as we think, in his gospel, traces of his professional inclinations. His eyes were constantly open, as a physician. In addition to the miracles of healing related by Matthew and Mark, he records the case of the woman, who was bowed together by an infirmity of eighteen years' standing (13 : 11—13), of a man cured of the dropsy (14 : 2—4), the only instance of this disease which is mentioned, and of the ten lepers (17 : 12—14). He is, also, particular, as a physician would naturally be, in describing the symptoms of diseases and their severity. Thus he says, that the mother of Peter was sick of "a great fever" (4 : 38); whereas the other evangelists say only that she was sick of a fever. He describes a man, who came to be healed, as "full of leprosy" (5 : 12); the others say, "a leper." He states the period during which the woman having an infirmity had suffered ; and how the weakness operated, in preventing her from assuming an upright posture. The accident which occurred in Siloam, the falling of a tower, by which eighteen men were killed, was an occurrence which, as a medical man, he easily remembered, and thought best to record it.

The gospel of Luke is distributed into five sections, for the more perfect accomplishment of the end proposed by the author,—to inform Theophilus "in order" (*καθεξῆς*), of the things which Jesus did and taught. Section I, embraces the

narrative of the birth of Christ, with the things which immediately went before, and those which followed—(chap. 1 and 2:—40). Section II, the youth of Christ (2: 41—52). Section III, the preaching of John and the baptism of Christ, together with the genealogy of the latter (chap. 3). Section IV embraces events which occurred in Galilee, during the three years' ministry of Christ (from chap. 4 to chap. 9: 51); for, after having narrated the temptation of Christ, which took place in the desert, he immediately adds (4: 14), that Jesus returned to Galilee; and he constantly speaks of Nazareth, Capernaum, and the lake of Gennesaret; describing events which transpired in Galilee to chap. 9: 51. Section V begins at chap. 9: 51, with Christ's last journey to Jerusalem. Hence, all the rest pertains to the latter part of the life of Christ.* By such an arrangement, Theophilus would be likely to gain a clear view of the chief occurrences in the life of Jesus.

We now come again to John, concerning whom we have already spoken so largely that nothing remains to us to be done, except to point out briefly the manner in which he has carried out the object proposed by him in 20: 31; viz., that Jesus Christ was the promised Messiah, and, thus, a being of divine dignity, "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, bodily." He commences with the assertion that the Word, that is, Christ (compare 1: 14, 15), was God (1: 1); that he was the Creator of all things (1: 3); that he was the source of life (1: 4), and the light of men. The first chapter contains the acknowledgment of John the Baptist, of Andrew, of Philip, and of Nathanael, that he was the Lamb of God, the Son of God, the King of Israel, of whom Moses and the prophets wrote. We have the assertion that he is the Omniscient Searcher of hearts, in each of the first two chapters (1: 48. 2: 24, 25). In his first miracle, it is affirmed that "he manifested forth his glory," i. e., as the Messiah (2: 11). With unquestioned right and solemn dignity, he is spoken of as clearing the temple of unworthy tenants, declaring that it was his Father's house, thus announcing his special relationship to God (2: 14—16). In chapter third, he intimates to Nicodemus, that he is the Son of God, sent to be the Saviour of the world (3: 2—21). In the fourth chapter,

* Rosenmueller, *Scholia in Nov. Test.*, Tom. II, p. 5.

in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, he directly affirms that he is the expected Messiah (4: 26). Afterwards, in successive chapters, he says, "I am the bread of life" (6: 48), "I am the resurrection and the life" (11: 25), "I am the way, and the truth, and the life" (14: 6). He bids men come to him as the source of life (4: 10). He declares his right and power to lay down his life, and to take it again (10: 18); and, by reason of the station which he holds, affirms that it is the duty of all men to honor the Son, even as they honor the Father (5: 23). When the Jews murmured against him, as if he assumed too high a rank, and exalted himself to a dignity to which none but God himself could aspire, instead of declining the honor to which he was understood to lay claim, he asserted, as if resolved to fix the impression which they had received, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" (5: 17). "The Son of Man, is Lord, also, of the Sabbath." A series of similar assertions and occurrences might be presented from this book, showing that it is an argument, as well as a narrative; an argument nobly conducted, and triumphantly carried out. But we content ourselves with a single additional statement, illustrating the ingenuity of the evangelist in making choice of incidents in the history of Christ, in harmony with his main purpose. He, certainly, knew all that the other evangelists had written. But he used very little of the same. He chose that which was conformed to his design, and, at the same time, had the merit of being new. In the history of the crucifixion, the other writers present the Saviour of men, in his last hours, faint, bleeding, and in agony; forsaken of his Father, yet praying, as with the trusting faith of a holy man, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." But John looks to another part of the scene. He passes over the exhibitions of the man, and is absorbed in the dignity of the God. The words that struck his ear and remained in his heart, were not the prayer of the Sufferer, but the sublime exclamation of the Conqueror: "When, therefore, Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, IT IS FINISHED; and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." Like one who had commenced a perilous undertaking and brought it to a glorious consummation, he exclaims, in that hour of mortal strife, with a voice of triumph,—as victory came in the moment of his death, "It is finished!"

We will add only, that John, probably, wrote his gospel at Patmos; and that his first epistle, as the "epistle dedicatory," was written as an introduction to the gospel, when he despatched it from the island where he was in banishment, to Ephesus, on the main land. The epistle is evidently on the same topic, and breathes the same spirit. He alludes in it to the fact of his having written the gospel which it was to accompany (1 John 2: 14). Perhaps it was because the church at Ephesus were specially deficient in mutual affection, that the epistle contains so many charges to them on the importance of love.

EDITOR.

ARTICLE VI.

GOD'S HAND IN AMERICA.

God's Hand in America. By REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.
New York. M. W. Dodd. pp. 168.

THERE have been a few books, of which it has been justly said that "they made their mark upon the age." We will not venture to predict that this will add one to the number of such books; but we hesitate not to say, that if the sentiments which it inculcates could be incorporated into the principles of action, and form a part of the mental furniture of the politicians, and especially the legislators of our country, it would exert a beneficial influence, second to that of few, if any, human compositions. The author's object is not to add one more to the strange and startling theories of which the present age is so prolific, but to hold out in bold relief the great principles which determine the destiny of nations, and to illustrate the bearing of those principles on the obligations resting upon American citizens. Politicians talk of this measure and that measure, of this system and that system, as essential to national prosperity. In our own country, the protective system, the free-trade system, and various others, have each their advocates, who would make us believe that nothing but the

adoption and the full carrying out of their principles is necessary, to raise the nation to the highest pinnacle of glory, and keep it there. But it is not by these things that the destiny of our country is to be settled. Far other influences than these, are to have the principal agency in determining whether our future course is to be one of glory and happiness, or of degradation and misery. Within certain limits, it is right that we should examine different schemes of policy, and compare their respective merits. In politics, as well as in religion, we should "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." But still, strict adherence to the great principles of moral rectitude is the life blood of our nation. The gospel, and the gospel only, can save us from running the race and sharing the fate of the republics of other times. How far we may sink in moral degradation, before we reach that point at which our destruction is sure, we cannot definitely say; but philosophy and religion concur in assuring us that there is such a point. Our government depends for its existence on the character of the people. We have no checks on the tyranny of a corrupt majority, no imposing military array to repress by its presence the spirit of insubordination. The love of freedom from restraint, so natural to man, when it gains a complete ascendancy over the other principles of our nature, is an uncompromising antagonist of law and government; inasmuch as these involve in their very nature the idea of restraint. In order, then, that a government of laws may be sustained and rendered efficient, some principle must be brought to act in opposition to this spirit of lawlessness. For this purpose we may appeal to the love of safety, of quiet, and of order, and also to patriotism and philanthropy; and this has been done, at least for a time, with some degree of success. Such was the case in the earlier and purer periods of the Roman republic. But none of these principles possess sufficient power, or can speak with sufficient authority, to awe into submission the more violent and tumultuous principles of our nature. They are too weak to be relied on, where interests so important are at stake. The power of religion is needed to give stability to republican institutions. This alone can curb that licentiousness, which often usurps the name of liberty; and guard it from running into fatal excesses.

The first of the great principles illustrated and enforced in this work is, that "God is governor among the nations," and

that our responsibility to him is as absolute in a national, as in an individual, capacity. This truth probably few would dare, in so many words, to deny. And yet, as the author of this work justly remarks, "among the nation at large there is such a practical disregard and denial of it, and of the Divine proprietary claim in human affairs, that the honest assertion and application of it in any deliberative public assembly is very likely to be ridiculed as the dotage of a superstitious mind." How seldom do we see, in the language or the conduct of legislative bodies, any recognition of the fact, that they are entrusted by God with the important office of framing laws for a nation; that they are his agents; and that, as such, they are accountable to him for the manner in which they use the power committed to them. There are happy exceptions, it is true; but with many public men, however much they may think of obligations to their constituents, their party, their country, a sense of obligation to God does not appear to be among the principles which guide their political course, or the elements which form their political character. Why is it thus? Why is it that men, who profess to recognize their accountability to the Supreme lawgiver in the private relations and affairs of life, should deny or disregard that accountability, when administering the affairs of a nation? The causes are all based upon the great fact of man's alienation from God.

In the first place, the very consciousness of possessing power often makes men forget that there is a Power above them. It was this consciousness of possessing power, that led Nebuchadnezzar to exclaim, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built by the might of my power, and the honor of my majesty." The same consciousness led the king of Assyria to make the blasphemous assertion, "As the gods of the nations of other lands have not delivered their people out of my hand, so shall not the God of Hezekiah deliver his people out of my hand." The consciousness of possessing power easily engenders pride; and, in a heart where pride reigns, a sense of dependence on God and of accountability to him is lost. Pride does not always produce this result in the same way. Sometimes it is a scornful rejection of the divine authority. Its language then is, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice?" But more frequently it fixes the thoughts exclusively on self, awaking in the soul lofty ideas of human resources, blotting out the sense of dependence on God, and

rendering the whole current of thought foreign to recognition of such dependence ; so that, even if an acknowledgement of it were made in words, it would be but a vapid and heartless admission of an unfelt truth.

Another cause, producing this state of mind is, that, in the machinery of government, second causes present a prominent and imposing aspect ; so that the mind is in danger of resting in them. So much skill may be shown in bringing these second causes to bear on particular courses of policy, so much knowledge of human nature may be exhibited in touching the springs of society, so as to produce the desired effect, and so magnificent are sometimes the results of such skill and knowledge, that we are dazzled by the brilliancy of the display, and forget that "except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." Thus the success of a plan of national policy, instead of leading to gratitude, often promotes self-confidence, and weakens or destroys the sense of accountability.

To the deplorable disposition to keep out of sight the relation of nations to God, as their governor, may be traced many prominent defects, both in the theory and the practice of legislation. A fair view of a subject can be taken only from a point which commands the whole field of investigation. If, in our theory of legislation, we leave God out of sight, our conclusions cannot fail to be incorrect. A striking illustration of this is furnished by those writers on political economy who have attempted to explain the respective duties of rulers and subjects, by referring to what they call the social compact. Forgetting or disregarding the declaration of holy writ, that "the powers that be are ordained of God," they labor to show that there is an implied contract between the individuals of a community, by which they have agreed to become an organized political body ; and, as such, to submit to the restraints of government. The uncertainty and indefiniteness which mark this theory, and its utter want of power over the conscience, stand in vivid contrast to the simplicity, and definiteness, and power, which characterize the declarations of Scripture on this subject. Not less injurious is the influence of this principle on practical legislation. We see in it a fruitful cause of fickleness in the enacting of laws, and of temporizing and faithlessness in the execution of them. Instead of looking upon themselves as agents, commissioned by

the all-wise ruler of the nations to carry out his plans, and bound to act in accordance with the directions which he has given, legislators have, to a great extent, regarded themselves as the absolute originators of legislation. Systems of policy, instead of resting on the immutable and universal principles of moral rectitude, have been based on doubtful views of temporary expediency, or narrow notions of local advantage. The plan of God's government is uniform and consistent throughout; every part, adapted to every other part, and to the whole. Hence, its stability. When men fall in with that plan, something of the same stability will be found in human legislation. But so long as legislators form their plans and enact laws without considering whether they coincide or not with the plans of the infinite ruler, legislation will be of a confused, indefinite, piece-meal character; interposing an absurd statute here, to counteract the evils of an equally absurd one there; and apparently aiming to compensate by the quantity of legislation, for the deficiency in quality. When two separate plans, arranged on different principles, and aiming at different results, exert their influence upon the same subjects, their operation cannot be harmonious; and the plan which is formed with the greatest wisdom, and carried into effect with the greatest power, will of course, thwart the action of the other, whenever they come into collision. Thus it is that legislators are so often compelled by unforeseen occurrences to alter their plans; and, like the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, to interweave cycles and epicycles in order to explain intricacies, which exist not in the plan of the great Lawgiver, but only in the deviations of human systems from that plan.

The second leading idea of our author is, that God deals with nations as with individuals. This truth is happily exhibited and clearly illustrated, and the perfect unity of individual and national morality is presented in a striking light. It would be well, if it were more generally felt, that what is sin in one man is sin in a nation. We are prone to imagine, that when the guilt of a community is divided among the members of that community, the share of each individual must be very small. But in the view of God it may be, and doubtless, often is far otherwise. If the members of a community individually give their assent to any measure which involves national guilt;—how much, in the view of "him who searcheth the heart," does the guilt of each individual

differ from the whole amount of guilt attached to that measure? And although it is impossible for us to determine who or how many are involved in the guilt of any iniquitous national act, or to proportion the guilt rightly among the delinquents; yet, God is abundantly able to do so. The light of that day which will "try the secrets of every heart," will make the justice of his decisions manifest to the universe.

It would, doubtless, be gross injustice to charge the guilt of every national sin on all the individuals of the nation by which that sin was committed. Still, such guilt is generally chargeable on many, besides the immediate actors. They whose influence has tended to create or strengthen in the public mind feelings leading to the commission of a particular national sin, or to increase that torpidity in the public conscience which encouraged and emboldened the immediate actors in it, unquestionably share in the guilt of it. Nor can those be acquitted, who saw the increasing corruption of public sentiment, and yet did not exert themselves to arrest the progress of national depravity. To contemplate the increase of national guilt without regret, and yet to be unwilling to make any effort to arrest it, indicates a state of feeling which Infinite Benevolence surely cannot regard as guiltless.

Our author next considers the manner in which nations are punished for their sins. In this connection, he first notices the relation of national sin and national ruin, as cause and effect; and then adverts to the judgments of God, inflicted on account of national transgressions. It cannot be doubted that there are national sins, which, when indulged, are surer agents of national ruin than any external causes. It was justly said of the Roman empire, that "she could not perish, till she had ruined herself;" and she did ruin herself most effectually. Our author happily illustrates the nature of national judgments, and the place which they hold in the government of God. The following remarks on the relation which successive generations in the same nation bear to each other, are highly appropriate:

"The life of a nation is a unity and continuity of generations. It is made up of a stream of existence, in which you cannot mark the point where one generation begins and another ends; like a woven fabric, in which you cannot tell where one thread ends or passes into another. There are habits of opinion, feeling and conduct, therefore, that belong to the same nation for ages, and in reference to which the whole continuous stream of generations, from beginning to end must be judged;

just as the responsibility of every part of a man's course of conduct is his own, through his whole life."

In connection with these remarks, it is interesting to observe the correspondence between the dealings of God with nations and with individuals. In Jeremiah 18, God says, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." In the 18th chapter of Ezekiel, we find the same principle stated in relation to individuals: "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die." If the individuals of a nation defend the guilty acts of their ancestors, they are, in the eye of God, sharers in the guilt of those acts; and, therefore, deserve to be involved in whatever punishment that guilt incurs. On the other hand, if they regard the sins committed by their nation in an earlier period of its existence, as furnishing just cause for national humiliation, then do they place themselves, so far as *those* sins are concerned, in the posture of a penitent nation; and they may justly rely upon the promise made to Jeremiah. True, they may be guilty of other sins, which will draw down the judgments of God. He may even use the sins of their forefathers as instruments of their punishment; but the evils which would have been inflicted on account of those sins which they have forsaken, will be averted.

It is often regarded as mysterious, that individuals are not unfrequently involved in the punishment of sins, in which they had no part. Thus, in national punishments, the sins of a former generation are sometimes visited upon a succeeding one; or, in the language of holy writ, God "visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of them that hate him." On this subject, Mr. Cheever justly remarks, that "in all such cases it is to be remembered that the suffering inflicted, though produced by the sins of others, falls not upon the guiltless, but upon those who deserve it all, and more than all, on account of

their own sins, and oftentimes by similar transgressions." This view of the subject is very important in forming correct apprehensions of the divine administration. God is a sovereign, but not a despot. On the contrary, as was well remarked by the late Dr. Payson, "the will of God is the perfection of reason." Under the government of such a Being, punishment will be inflicted in such a way as will most effectually accomplish the object aimed at; but, at the same time, its infliction will be in perfect accordance with the principles of justice. Our Saviour told the Jews that on them would come all the righteous blood shed since the foundation of the world; but to these same Jews he said, that they "allowed the deeds of their fathers." They were not punished for the sins of their fathers, but for cherishing the same spirit and acting on the same principles, that led to the commission of those sins. By timely repentance and reformation they might have avoided that punishment; else, why did the Saviour say, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to thy peace," etc.? But there are instances in which judgments inflicted on the wicked, involve those who had no share in the sins which were the procuring cause of those judgments. In relation to such cases, it should be borne in mind, as our author suggests, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and that, therefore, all deserve punishment; and God may rightly, if he sees fit, use the sins of one individual or nation to punish those of another individual or nation. He has often done so. Thus the sins of Saul not only brought ruin upon himself and his family, but spread desolation through the kingdom of Israel, as a just retribution for their wickedness in asking a king. When we see those who appear to us comparatively innocent involved in the punishments inflicted upon the manifestly guilty, we should remember that "God seeth not as man seeth," and that he may see hardened obstinacy and daring rebellion, where we see little or nothing to censure. And even where the blow falls on those who are reckoned among the excellent of the earth, we should guard, on the one hand, against the error of those who, in beholding such things, are ready to say, "The Lord hath forsaken the earth;" and, on the other, against that of Job's three friends, who regarded his afflictions as a sure indication of aggravated, but concealed guilt.

In remarking upon our grounds of national gratitude, Mr. Cheever justly enumerates the effusion of the Holy Spirit among our greatest blessings. Whether the manner in which he uses the term, "baptism of the Spirit," in connection with this blessing, is fully accordant with the use of a similar expression in Scripture, may perhaps be questioned. When the Saviour promised his disciples that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, he did not mean that their hearts should be renewed; for this had been done already. Nor do we suppose that he meant simply or primarily, an effusion of the Spirit, in the sense in which that term is now commonly used; for we do not find the term thus generally applied in the Bible. Indeed, if we mistake not, in the numerous instances of revivals under the preaching of the apostles, we do not find this expression used, except in cases where miraculous powers were conferred. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that it is employed in Scripture with reference to those miraculous powers, which were abundantly bestowed on the disciples at the day of Pentecost, and in some degree at other times, rather than to those influences of divine grace, by which sinners are converted and saints made to grow in grace. Great care should be taken, in using scriptural language, to apply it as it was intended to be applied. A practice the reverse of this tends to produce indefiniteness of thought and inaccuracy of reasoning, and thus gives rise to many errors. The case now under consideration is far less objectionable than many of the kind that we have known; but the practice is throughout a dangerous one, and the better course would be to abandon it entirely.

The propositions which the author of the work before us has thus far discussed, are, he remarks, preliminary to his main subject, viz.: The opportunities and responsibilities of this country for its own and the world's evangelization. Our limits forbid us to follow him through his able and faithful elucidation of this topic. We can merely advert to the leading points which he discusses. The example and influence of our ancestors, the freedom of thought which exists among us, the popular character of our government, the simplicity of our institutions, the rocking of the tempests which have given strength and firmness to our constitution, and the complete

separation of church and state among us, are successively exhibited as indications that God has much for America to do in the great enterprise of the world's regeneration. Having thus considered the influences upon our character, which tend to fit us for an efficient and beneficial agency in this great work, he proceeds to exhibit the means which God has given us for making the results of that agency vast in extent and glorious in character. In this connection, he enumerates the general character of the American ministry, the high standard of theological education among us, the prevalence of revivals, the richness of our language, and the number and character of those who speak it, the religious character of our literature, the rapid increase of our population, the universality of a good common school education, and the geographical position of our country, as affording us peculiar advantages and imposing upon us peculiar responsibilities. He is not, however, among those who can see nothing but brightness in our prospects;—who take it for granted that we shall, of course, act up to our high responsibilities, and worthily improve our exalted privileges. He remarks, that “there is a gloomier prospect in the probabilities of our country's future destiny,” and that “we may turn every one of our vast capabilities to ruin, except God keep us humble, and preserve in us a spirit of deep contrition and dependence on him.” Such warnings as this can hardly be too often repeated.

The style of the work is, in general, well adapted to the subject, unaffected, perspicuous, and marked by that definiteness of expression, which is generally found in connection with definiteness of thought. An air of sincerity pervades the work, resulting from a heartfelt conviction of the truth and importance of the principles inculcated, and happily calculated to impress those principles deeply on the mind of the reader. Many portions of the work are marked by a peculiar glow of expression. In this respect, however, it is somewhat unequal. There are passages in which a greater degree of fervor would have awakened deeper interest in the views presented, without impairing the strength or diminishing the conclusiveness of the reasoning. We quote from the work a passage which finely illustrates this quality of style, and shows with what vividness Mr. Cheever can present objects to the “mind's eye.” Many will remember this passage, who, had

it been coldly expressed, would hardly retain a trace of it in their recollection.

"I have stood beneath the walls of the Coliseum in Rome, the Parthenon in Athens, and the Temple of Karnak in Egypt,—each of them the mighty relic of majestic empires, and the symbol of the spirit of the most remarkable ages in the world. The last, carrying you back, as in a dream, over the waste of four thousand years, might be supposed to owe its superior impressiveness to its vast antiquity: but that is not the secret of the strange and solemn thoughts that crowd into the mind; it is the demonstration of God's wrath, fulfilled according to the letter of the Scriptures! No ruins of antiquity are so overwhelming in their interest as the gigantic remains of that empire, once the proudest in the world, and now, according to the very letter of the divine prediction, the 'basest of the kingdoms.' From the deep and grim repose of those sphinxes, obelisks, and columns,—those idols broken at the presence of God, as the mind wanders back to the four hundred years of Israel's bondage in Egypt, methinks you may hear the wail of that old and awful prophecy, with the lingering echo of every successive prediction,—'*the nation whom they shall serve will I judge.*' Who would have believed it possible, four thousand years ago, amidst the vigor and greatness of the Egyptian kingdom, that, after that vast lapse of time, travellers should come from a world then as new, unpeopled and undiscovered as the precincts of another planet, to read the proofs of God's veracity in the vestiges at once of such stupendous glory and such a stupendous overthrow! And now, if any man, contemplating the youthful vigor, the energy, the almost indestructible life of our own country, finds it difficult to believe that the indulgence of the same national sin, under infinitely clearer light, may be followed with a similar overthrow, let him wander on the banks of the Nile, and think down hours to moments in the silent sanctuaries of her broken temples."

We think it is not too much to say, that Mr. Cheever, in preparing this work, has done a service both to the cause of religion and of his country. If ever the community are brought to entertain right views and cherish right feelings in relation to the great subjects of which he treats, it will probably be done not by a general, overwhelming influence, suddenly revolutionizing the tastes, and habits, and modes of thought and feeling now prevalent; but by the blessing of God attending various exhibitions of truth, and various appeals to the heart and the conscience,—each acting on those minds to which it is peculiarly adapted. We doubt not that this work will exert on not a few minds a silent, unseen influence, which, uniting with other influences of a similar character, will be more and more extensively diffused, as years roll on, and that it will do its part in improving the character, and brightening the destinies of man. This influence, though perhaps

imperceptible to human eye, will not be so to the eye of him who "seeth the end from the beginning." The showers of spring sink in the earth and disappear; but each does its part in aiding the progress of vegetation; and though we cannot assign a specific degree of influence to each, we know that should they all be withheld, universal desolation would ensue. So it is with many of the influences which act on the character and prospects of our race. Gradually and silently they modify the opinions, and purify the motives and feelings of those on whom they act. The results are seen in the more extensive prevalence of Christian principle and feeling, while, at the same time, few comparatively of the causes from which those results flow, can be distinctly traced. Such is the agency which God has employed,—such, we believe, is that which he will continue to employ in effecting the regeneration of the world. No one, then, need be discouraged because he sees no manifest results flowing from his efforts to do good. Let him go on, faithfully employing whatever influence he possesses in the service of God and for the good of man; and his agency will not be lost among the influences which are destined to make "the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose."

R. A. C.

ARTICLE VII.

TRAVELS IN EUROPE AND THE EAST.

Travels in Europe and the East, embracing observations made during a tour through Great Britain, Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Prussia, Saxony, Bohemia, Austria, Bavaria, Switzerland, Lombardy, Tuscany, the Papal States, the Neapolitan Dominions, Malta, the islands of the Archipelago, Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, Turkey, Moldavia, Wallachia and Hungary, in the years 1834-1841. By VALENTINE MOTT, M. D. pp. 452. 8vo. New York. Harpers, 1842.

Sketches of Foreign Travel and Life at Sea; including a cruise on board a man-of-war, as also a visit to Spain, Portugal, the south of France, Italy, Sicily, Malta, the Ionian Islands, Continental Greece, Liberia, and Brazil; and a Treatise on the Navy of the United States. By REV. CHARLES ROCKWELL, late of the United States Navy. Boston. Tappan & Dennet. 1842. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 404, 437.

THESE volumes, by gentlemen of two of the learned professions, carry us in part over the same ground. Dr. Mott, broken down in his nervous system by incessant occupation in his business as a surgeon, sought in the relaxation incident to a foreign tour, the restoration of health. Mr. Rockwell, having long cherished a desire to visit foreign lands, at the close of his theological education, matured a plan for devoting two or three years to a minute examination of the most interesting portions of the old world. He was already a man of cultivated mind and manners, and had become favorably known to the community as a teacher in the Hartford Asylum for the deaf and dumb. Besides, "being familiar with the more prevalent languages of southern Europe, he hoped to gain access to the latest and most accurate sources of information in the way of social intercourse and of books, respecting the countries he should visit,—their recent history, manners and customs, religious rites and usages, institutions of educa-

tion and benevolence, and other matters of interest." His connection with the navy of the United States arose from the fact that the privilege of a passage to the Mediterranean in a man-of-war of the larger class had been granted him by the Secretary of the Navy, and, as there was no chaplain on board, he yielded to the inducements offered him to discharge the duties of the office, during most of the succeeding cruise of two years and a half.

As the ship was, at times, for weeks or months together, in ports adjacent to the most interesting portions of southern Europe, every desirable facility was furnished for frequent excursions inland, as also for residing in families where the various languages of that region were spoken in their purity. Being relieved from his professional duties for the period of six months, by the transfer of a chaplain from another ship to that in which he sailed, he was enabled to cross Spain and Portugal in different directions, at his leisure; to reside for a time in the capitals, and to visit the most important cities of these two kingdoms; resorting to almost every possible means of conveyance, becoming familiar with the habits and modes of life of the various classes of society, learning from original sources the disclosures resulting from the then recent suppression of the convents, and other matters of interest connected with the Catholic faith, now travelling with smugglers through wild and unfrequented paths, and then in the stately diligence, rolling along the royal highway; one day roaming through princely palaces, and the next a captive to lawless robbers. Thus cut off from all who spoke his own language, and domesticated among those of other tongues, he met with many singular incidents, and enjoyed peculiar facilities for acquiring interesting and useful information. The tour and foreign residence of Dr. Mott extended to a period of seven years. Mr. Rockwell was abroad about three. Both these gentlemen carried their professional character with them. They travelled with their eyes open, in reference to all subjects which had any connection with their favorite objects of pursuit. We are favored, in the journal of the one, with the day-book of a medical tourist, and in the other, in a more perfect manner, with the investigations of an intelligent and curious clergyman. They give us information on points connected with their respective professions. The books bear internal evidence of

having been written, the one by a distinguished surgeon, the other by an accurate general scholar, and an enlightened divine.

Nor are we offended, that the volumes maintain this distinctive character. We praise them for it. We love to see the mark of men left upon their works; a mark, testifying not only who the author is, but what he is. If a man makes investigations, in reference to the department of science or of life to which he is devoted, we have a guaranty in his professional character that it will be done well. A person is competent to make examinations and to draw conclusions in reference to topics with which he is familiar, who, should he attempt to go far into other departments, would soon give evidence of not being at home. It is exactly the process, of which we have the elements in these volumes, that is suited to give us a thorough acquaintance with foreign countries. A person of common intelligence can give us the mere outside view commonly furnished by travellers; an account of the position of lakes and the course of rivers, the nature of the soil and productions, the description of scenery, the distance of places one from another; the statistics of population, the occupations of the people, their character and manners, their architecture, their amusements, their religion, their laws. These items of knowledge are all good in their place. But we wish for something more. Such topics have already been sufficiently discussed before the community. We are now in want of something more minute and thorough. We wish a divine to give us information of the real state of their theology; a philosopher, to enlighten us concerning their metaphysics; a man of extensive classical acquirements, to unite for us the far distant past with the present; a learned instructor, to make us acquainted with the details of their systems of education; a physician, to open to us the condition of medical science; an artizan, to tell us of their successful prosecution of the mechanic arts; and a lawyer, to present to us a satisfactory history of their politics and legislation. We do not expect, at least not for many years, all these helps, to an acquaintance with the various nations of the earth, or even of Europe and Asia. In general, we are forced to consent to have one man travel and report for us whatever we wish to know in every department, or else remain in ignorance. Hence there are often things which we wish to know concerning foreign

countries, for which we consult our books of travels in vain. But happily some of our tourists are so well prepared for a journey to the old world, that they bring home a mass of information in every department of knowledge, partly, it is true, in a crude and undigested state; partly, in the form of indistinct suggestions, which are to be afterwards corrected and filled up. We are fortunate in gradually coming in possession of the resources which we need, one topic being presented to us by one traveller, and another by a succeeding one. The volumes before us are contributions towards a collection of what we may be permitted to denominate topical travels.

In Dr. Mott's book we cannot but confess ourselves disappointed. The high reputation of the author in the useful career to which he is devoted, led us with raised expectations to the perusal of his journal. The writer is exalted to undue prominence. We feel that he does not sufficiently forget what he considers due to his own merits. It is unpleasant to us to see an author sustaining with so much anxiety his own claims to veneration and gratitude. A spirit of amiable self-forgetfulness would have comported more fully with the distinguished abilities, which we have been accustomed to ascribe to the doctor. The work is hardly minute enough, in its professional statements, to satisfy the inquiries of scientific medical men. And for general readers, there is too little which has not appeared again and again in the descriptions of former travellers. To the style we cannot award unqualified praise. We perceive in it internal evidence, that the author's hand has for a considerable time been more familiar with the knife, than the pen. Dissection, or amputation, or some other operation, performed on many of his sentences, would be extremely beneficial. The reputation of Dr. M., we predict, will continue to be professional, rather than literary.

But while we make thus free with the volume, as a literary effort, we disclaim any imputation of disrespect to the highly esteemed and justly honored author. Notwithstanding the defects of his work, he has done us a service in introducing us to an acquaintance with the state of medical science in foreign countries. The accounts which he gives of other objects of interest, will also be valuable to those who are not already familiar with them.

There are fewer objections to be made to the work of Mr. Rockwell. His style is generally unassuming. Like transparent glass, it permits you to see through it the objects which it is designed to disclose, without having the attention constantly drawn to the medium through which the objects are discovered. While he goes thoroughly into those points in which his profession as a clergyman gives him an interest, he treats well also of general topics; solving, in most cases, the chief questions which one would be likely to propose in reference to the places visited by him, whether relating to the present or the past. He manifests no carelessness in his matter or manner. His book is evidently the result of laborious and careful investigation. It is not a token of regard for a few choice friends, who will admire whatever is written, for the writer's sake; but a strong effort to inform and instruct, as well as to gratify his readers. He introduces freely topics of a moral and religious character, accounts of missionary stations, and of efforts to promote the spiritual welfare of those with whom he came in contact, of the state of the pulpit in various countries, and of the influence of various forms of religion. These are themes in which the community are deeply interested. The project of evangelizing the world, through the benevolence of Christians, has made men intelligent. It has introduced them to a knowledge of geography, to an acquaintance with the world, to an interest in the diffusion of science and education, and a concern for people living in remote and barbarous climes. The cause of missions, by a reflex influence, has blessed the Christian as truly, if not as much, as the heathen. Men wish to know what becomes of their benefactions, and to see what effects are wrought by them. Hence, the information given in these volumes will be acceptable to the general reader. Amid so much that is excellent and worthy of our unqualified praise, we may be permitted to add, that, in our own opinion, it might have been as well for the respected author to omit the ambitious verses, with which his pages are occasionally broken. We can pardon this simple defect; but we could wish that, if others' tastes resemble our own, they might, in subsequent editions be omitted.

Dr. Mott commenced his tour by a visit to England, Scotland and Ireland. Thence crossing to the continent, he passed through France, Belgium, Prussia, Austria, and Switzerland,

to Italy, where he visited Rome, Naples, Mount Vesuvius, and other celebrated points. Thence he took passage for Malta, journeyed through Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, and returned, by Constantinople, along the Danube to Vienna, and thence to Paris, which was the residence of his family during the period of his absence from America.

Mr. Rockwell sailed from Boston for Gibraltar, spent some time at Mahon, then visited Naples, with its surrounding objects of interest, including Vesuvius, Pompeii, etc., and Rome. After this, he made the tour of Portugal and Spain; proceeded to Marseilles, Genoa, Leghorn and Florence, Sicily, Malta, Greece, Malaga. After this he sailed for Africa, visiting the colonies of Liberia and Cape Palmas, and returned home by way of Brazil. The last two chapters of his volume are occupied with a series of remarks, communicating much useful and entertaining information respecting the navy of the United States. Thus while the routes of the two travellers, in part, coincided, some places of great interest were omitted by each, but the deficiency in our information is supplied by the journal of the other. For example, Dr. Mott devotes a hundred pages to Egypt, which form some of the most valuable portions of his volume; and Mr. Rockwell gives us a hundred and fifty pages respecting other portions of Africa and Brazil, besides his instructive statements in reference to the American navy.

We propose to give our readers some extracts from the volumes before us, as a specimen of their character, and for the sake of the information which they communicate. The first, from Dr. Mott, is an account of Alexandria, and the celebrated columns in its neighborhood.

"The site of ancient Alexandria is a dreary waste of sand hills, stones, and fragments of bricks and household utensils, to remind the traveller that here was once the abode of human beings; that in a circumference of 15 miles was a city, containing from 3 to 400,000 of the human race. Where are they gone? Where is the once famous Alexandrian library, the then wonder of the world? not even a wreck of it is left behind. On this waste of sand, nothing stands but the huge obelisk of Egyptian granite, called Cleopatra's needle, of one entire piece, larger than the sandstone obelisk of Luxor, in the Place Louis Quinze at Paris; and the beautiful colossal pillar of Pompey, of the same stone. This last is a round pillar of exquisite workmanship, and also of one entire piece. These are the only mementoes in this sandy waste to call to one's mind what the city was in the days of the Pharaohs, the Ptolemies, and Cleopatra.

"The ruins are in the immediate environs of the modern city, and

are a mass of rubbish, partly submerged in the sand of the desert. They look like the confused masses of brick and mortar after one of our ravaging fires. In many places, however, the cellars of the ancient buildings were apparent, and could be penetrated without difficulty. These remains of the old capital are several acres in extent, and, taken in connection with what must have disappeared, show that a vast population, as all historic authority agrees, must have for ages existed in this once favorite capital of the great Macedonian conqueror, Alexander; and which he honored with his name and adorned with his munificent patronage, and with that wondrous library, which contained all the science, learning, and literature then extant. Excavations are from time to time being made, and various antiques, such as coins and other articles, are found in abundance. The only objects worthy of particular notice, of a monumental kind, are the Needle and Pillar, already mentioned.

"These are vast *monoliths* of the sienite of Egypt, hard, compact, and of gray color, being of the peculiar variety of that primitive formation of rock found at Siena, in the mountain ranges of Upper Egypt. They are every way worthy of the grandeur of the ancient architecture of this country, and did not disappoint us, as some things in Greece did, by their size falling short of our expectations. They are both of great height.

"*Pompey's Pillar* stands about half a mile from the city, on a sandy elevation, and makes a most conspicuous and magnificent appearance. My own impression is, that it is probably one of a series of columns, that once adorned some vast edifice. It is smooth, perfectly cylindrical, and highly polished, with a regular pediment and beautiful capital. There is not a vestige of inscription upon it, and it is in every respect as perfect and unmutilated as though finished but yesterday, though it has stood there, in all probability, over 3000 years. How this and the needle have been so miraculously preserved through all the desolating wars and visitations of hordes of Greeks, Romans, Persians, Saracens, and Turks, in their successive conquests, is to us an enigma perfectly inexplicable.

"*Cleopatra's Needle* is nearer the modern city, and, though thus named, is doubtless far more ancient than the Pillar, and of more pure Egyptian architecture, being, as is familiarly known, an obelisk covered with hieroglyphics, most beautifully executed, and in excellent preservation. That both the pillar and the needle, though they derive their present names from some imaginary and poetic association in later times with the loves of Pompey and Cleopatra, were built for ages before the time of those individuals, by monarchs who little dreamed that their character would be thus profaned, is proved by the fact that the hieroglyphics on one side of the needle, or obelisk, are exclusively devoted to a narration of the deeds of the famous Egyptian conqueror, that other Napoleon or Alexander, SESOSTRIS, whose history covers, indeed, the facade of almost every temple, obelisk, or column now extant in that country. He was the first of the nineteenth dynasty, and existed at least 1400 years before Christ. Within a few feet of this obelisk is a second, which is prostrate, and partly buried in the sand."

Dr. Mott found, in most of the places which he visited, medical schools, hospitals, and professors of the healing art.

England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Prussia, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy are all distinguished more or less by medical and surgical skill. He remarks that M. Roux, a surgeon at Paris, had *extracted the cataract* more than *six thousand times*; and that he had performed the lateral section of *lithotomy* about *six hundred times*. But on going among the followers of Mohammed, over whom broods an almost universal night, he found that medicine and surgery have made no progress. In that portion of his journal which relates to Constantinople, he writes:

"*Fatalism* is a striking feature in the character of the Mussulmen generally. They say, 'Whatever is, is right,' and under this belief they repose in the most unwavering security and confidence. The greatest temporal evils they use no means to ward off or avert, but content themselves by saying that it is from God, and therefore that it is in vain to escape from them, and that it is their duty to submit with patience and resignation. It is on this account that the plague ravages and depopulates their cities, because they consider it a visitation from God. This faith leads them to seek for no means to cure or methods to arrest it, when it happens to appear among them. If they would allow of medicaments to be fairly and properly tried, suitable means of cleanliness and ventilation to be introduced, as are generally sought for and used among Christians, I do not believe it would long continue so appalling and frightful a scourge to the Eastern world.

"To the professors of the healing art, therefore, these countries hold out very few inducements. Few of the Turks ever think of seeking for relief, under any emergency of suffering whatever. The physician or surgeon who resides among them must build his hopes upon the Frank population.

"As far as I could learn, there never was an instance of a Mussulman submitting to an amputation or any other surgical operation; for, though every prospect of saving life could thereby be fairly presented, he prefers to adhere strictly to his faith, and to die."—p. 434.

But if the Mohammedan system shuts up its followers in universal night, degrading and debasing them, and depriving them of the light of science and of religion,—on the ground of the old principle upon which their leader destroyed the Alexandrian library,—little more can be claimed for Catholicism. There are enlightened men in its ranks; but they have not to thank their religious system for it. They derive their illumination from the surrounding influences of Protestantism. They have left the worship of the true God to serve idols; and, though they form a reputed portion of the Christian world, their idolatry is no less debasing on that account. It is not true, that they use pictures in their churches, simply for

the purpose of fixing the attention. The lower classes of people, at least, pay them divine honors. "One cannot be long in Spain," says Mr. Rockwell, "without ceasing to wonder that the Catholics have stricken from their copies of the decalogue the command of God, which forbids the making and the worship of graven images." Even their ideas of spiritual objects are strangely mingled with that which is earthly and sensual. Let the following serve as an illustration :

"The pictures and images in Catholic churches often give incorrect, debasing, and even disgusting views of Scripture scenes and characters. The Spanish call the Virgin Mary the Lord God's mother ; and all their pictures of her, with Christ as an infant in her arms, or lying in the manger, or as a little child by her side, conspire, with the rites of the church, in making the impression on the mind, that she is a more important character, and deserving of higher veneration, than the Saviour himself. A traveller in Mexico describes a picture of the Last Supper, which is in a church there, where the cherubim and seraphim are acting as cooks and scullions. They are represented as little else than head and wings, but all busily employed. One is scouring a dish, in a kind of modern European kitchen ; another is blowing the fire in the Spanish manner ; a third frying eggs ; while, in the back-ground, some are officiating as waiters, handling the plates, and making all necessary preparations."—Vol. I, p. 71.

By means of the Index Expurgatorius, the key of knowledge is taken away from the people. If they are able to read, they are not permitted to peruse works which would instruct and elevate them. Any thing calculated to enlarge the mind and to burst its shackles, is studiously forbidden.

"Thus we find, in the rules of the Index adopted by the Council of Trent, that not only were all books prohibited which, previously to the year 1515, had been condemned, either by the Popes or by general councils, but also (to use the words of the decree), 'The books of heresiarchs, who, since that year, had originated or advocated heresies, as also of those who are the heads or leaders of heretics, such as Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Balthasar, Pacimontanus, Schwenckfeldius, and others like them, are entirely prohibited.'

"The copy of the Roman Index now before me, was published in 1758, and has, in the form of an appendix, additional lists of books, put forth in the years 1763, 1770, and 1779. In 1786, a new edition of the Index was published, containing, with subsequent additions, 5,600 prohibited books. The present Pope has just published another edition, containing more than 8,000 works. Among the books prohibited, are the histories of Hume, Gibbon, Mosheim, and Robertson ; the metaphysical works of Locke, and his Reasonableness of Christianity ; Copernicus, on the Revolutions of Celestial Bodies ; all the works of Erasmus, Tillotson's Sermons, Combe's Phrenology, History of the Operations of the British Bible Societies ; the eleventh volume of Sismondi's History of the Italian Republics, and his smaller work on the same subject,

which was prepared for Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia. This last work I bought of a bookseller in Florence, who informed me that he was permitted to sell it in English, but not in either Italian or French. To the list of works noticed above, we might add most of the truly able and independent works in history, theology, and the various sciences which have been published in Europe for several centuries past.

"The only editions of the Bible tolerated in Italy are that of Martini, Archbishop of Florence, published in 1803, with copious notes, making in all thirty-six octavo volumes; and another by an Archbishop of Turin, in twenty-three large volumes. The price of one of these editions, which I met with in a bookstore in Naples, was more than one hundred and twenty dollars. Thus, for the poor, at least, it must there be extremely difficult to obey the divine command, to search the Scriptures. The only religious books which they are permitted to have, are the lives of a few Catholic saints, containing quite as much fable as truth."—Vol. I, pp. 206, 207, 208.

While we are speaking on the subject of books, it may not be uninteresting to our readers to learn a fact or two, somewhat more minutely than our books have generally informed us, in respect to the "Propaganda," or missionary college at Rome.

"It was founded by Gregory the Fifteenth, in 1622, and was afterwards enlarged by Urban the Eighth, who gave it a capital of 615,000 scudi, and a yearly revenue of 24,000 scudi. He also assigned to it the splendid palace which it now occupies, in the vicinity of the Piazza di Spagna, a large public square in the midst of the city. A Spaniard, named Vides, founded scholarships for ten young men of different nations, and to these were added twelve more by Cardinal Onofrio, in 1637, the pupils of which were to be selected from the Georgians, Persians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Melchites, and Copts. In 1639, the same Cardinal added another fund, for thirteen Ethiopians and Brahmins. After this, funds were given for Chinese and Japanese, but, as the climate of Rome was unfavorable to these last, their school was removed to Naples. The pupils live two in one cell, and are required to be very studious, and make most of their excursions in companies, walking two and two. I have seen them thus passing along the streets of Rome, the black and the white being mixed up together in true abolitionist style. They wear black dresses, with five red buttons,—the five wounds of Christ,—with long black strips hanging down the back, and a red belt around the body, the symbol of that sacrifice of life to which the missionary devotes himself. The Jewish missionary, Wolff, was formerly pupil of this college. The library of the Propaganda contains a fine collection of oriental books and manuscripts, among which are many valuable Chinese and Syriac works, memorials of former extensive missionary operations in the East. The school at Naples had recently nine Chinese and four Greeks; and the college at Rome eighty pupils, who, with the exception of eighteen Armenians and five Maronites, were all Europeans, mostly Germans and Dutch."—Vol. II, pp. 247, 248.

But for what are the young men, designed for the ministry, educated? Alas! for any thing, rather than to be heralds of

glad tidings to a ruined world ; the bearers of the message of peace to the nations ; the unfolders of the book of life to those whose hunger and thirst need to be allayed by its living bread and its sweet waters. The preaching of the gospel is God's appointed instrumentality for saving the world. Who can but admire its benign influence in this our country ? Where it is enjoyed, in its evangelical fervor and power, it spreads a charm over life itself. As the Sabbath diffuses its air of hallowed tranquillity, and its pleasant sanctuaries invite the willing worshipper, the laborer forgets his toil ; the brow of care is smoothed ; the sigh of the mourner is assuaged. The voice of the man of God comes in joyful tones to the weary ; and, as the weak is encouraged, the sorrowing, comforted, the wanderer, allured back to the fold of Christ, the ignorant, instructed, and the wayward, warned and entreated, the gospel proves to be "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The Sabbath, cheered by such ministrations, is a true emblem and antepast of the Sabbatism above. But not so in Catholic countries. Let Mr. R. again speak :

"The Catholic sermons, in Spain and Italy, are divided into two classes,—the moral, or such as treat of points of doctrine and duty, and the panegyrics, or eulogies on the saints. The latter class are by far the most numerous, and were formerly paid for in Spain by the civil authorities of the respective towns where they were delivered. The Virgin Mary, and her husband, St. Joseph, are each honored with seven or eight of these discourses, and so on with the other prominent saints in the calendar. Those which I have heard, consisted of declamations on the wonderful virtues and merits of these worthies, their great influence in obtaining from God the forgiveness of our sins ; and hence was inferred their high and peculiar claims to our veneration, as intercessors for us at the throne of Heaven.

"The image of the saint, arrayed in gorgeous robes, and decked with tinsel and finery, occupies a conspicuous place in the centre of the church, or on the high altar ; and when the service is over, the assembly show their devotion, by crowding around it and whispering their prayers, often with tears in their eyes ; they humbly kiss the hem of the idol's garments, or the ends of the ribands which hang from its neck, and raise up their little children in their arms, that they too may do the same. Were I to behold a Christian assembly worshipping their Maker with the same outward signs of sincerity and earnestness as is shown to these dumb idols, I should certainly think them very devout ; and after having witnessed this veneration of the saints, he who tells me that it is not idolatry, spends his breath in vain ; for both merchants and missionaries tell us, that the blindest votaries of African or Hindoo superstition, make as broad and definite distinctions between the senseless images before which they bow, and the deified heroes or other spiritual beings which these idols represent, as do the followers

of the Virgin Mary, and the host of inferior saints. It is, too, a striking fact in this connection, that the king of the Sandwich Islands, in a recent interview with a Commodore of our Navy, remarked, that the reason why he expelled the Jesuit missionaries from his dominions was, not from any intended persecution of them on the ground of their religious opinions, but because they violated the laws of his kingdom against idolatry. A little observation, and a moderate share of common sense, is worth more, on a subject of this kind, than all the subtle logic and finespun reasoning in the world; and it would doubtless be difficult to make this monarch understand the precise difference between the reverence claimed by his Jesuit neighbors for the images of the saints, and that which he and his subjects formerly paid to those tawdry, savage, grinning and horrid looking idols which may now be seen in missionary and other museums of the United States.

"A gentleman who has spent many years in the south of Italy, who is familiar with the language, and often attends the Catholic churches, gave me the following account of the preachers. The most decent and devout are those who deliver the panegyrics on the saints. The second class are wild and raving fanatics, who rage, and shout, and sing, and scream, and use the most extravagant gestures and contortions of body, in order to work upon the passions of their hearers, and rouse them up to the highest pitch of excitement. He said that he once saw a preacher of this class, in one of the largest churches of Naples, who, among other extravagant tricks, hurled a cross which he held in his hands at the heads of his audience, as if to prostrate them in repentance, but it was secured to his arm by a cord, so that it did not reach those at whom it was aimed; and though they bowed themselves down to avoid it, they were, in the end, far more frightened than hurt. The third class of preachers are regular buffoons, of the lowest grade, who practise in the pulpit every species of vulgar wit, pantomime, and grimace, in order to excite in the audience the same indecent and boisterous laughter which is caused by similar exhibitions on the stage. As an instance of this, he said that he once heard a clerical buffoon of this class, preaching about the embassy of the Gibeonites to Joshua, and after a number of low jokes, as to the title by which they probably addressed the Jewish leader, he came to the verse which says, that they wore old shoes, and clouted on their feet. In order to elucidate this part of the subject, he had dressed out one of his own feet, in the manner described in the text, and having thrown it over the front of the pulpit so that all the audience might see it, and thus standing on one leg and hanging by the other, he proceeded, amidst immense applause, to comment at length, on this important matter. There was, some years since, in Spain, a friar known by name of Padre Diego de Cadiz, who was regarded as an inspired prophet. He travelled on foot through all parts of the kingdom; and such was the eloquence of his sermons, that large numbers of his hearers often proceeded on the spot, to scourge and to beat themselves most violently, as a penance for their sins. How much good might such a man have effected, had he, instead of enjoining this self-righteous penance, directed his convicted hearers, in accordance with the Scripture, to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world."—Vol. I, pp. 308—310.

We should be glad to follow Mr. R. through both his volumes, and present extracts on most of the topics upon

which he speaks. But to lay before our readers whatever we deem valuable would be almost to copy the book entire. The accounts given by him of the missionary efforts of Mr. Rule in Gibraltar, and of the brethren in Africa are highly interesting. So, also, are the facts which he states in his official character, as chaplain of the ship in which he sailed. But we must content ourselves with a single extract further, finely illustrating the author's happy style. It is in reference to the buried cities, Pompeii and Herculaneum.

These cities "are supposed to have been founded 1342 years before Christ, so that when destroyed they had stood 1400 years. They were much injured by an earthquake A. D. 63; and on the twenty-fourth of August, in the year 79, were entirely buried by an eruption of Vesuvius. Dion Cassius thus describes their destruction. 'An incredible quantity of ashes, carried by the wind, filled air, earth, and sea; suffocating men, cattle, birds, and fishes, and burying two entire cities, namely, Herculaneum and Pompeii, while their inhabitants were seated in the theatres.' Very few skeletons, however, have been found in the theatres, and hence it is supposed, that most of the people took timely warning and escaped. The Coliseum at Rome, and other places where public shows were held in ancient times, were so constructed, and had so many outlets, that they could be emptied almost instantly. The amphitheatre at Pompeii has ninety-seven places of egress, and so judiciously are they arranged, that 20,000 persons might safely pass out through them in two minutes and a half. It is probable, therefore, that the people, being warned of what was coming, fled for safety to the adjoining river and seacoast, and hastily embarked in such vessels as they could find.

"Herculaneum, being near the foot of Vesuvius, is covered with solid lava, and successive eruptions, which have overflowed it, have buried it to the depth of from twenty to a hundred feet. Thus, most that has been done there, is by excavations; and one must pass under this immense bed of lava to see the parts of the city which have been explored. The first discovery of the place in modern times, was made by a peasant at Portici, A. D. 1713. While digging a well, he came to some pieces of mosaic, and further researches brought to light valuable statues and other curiosities. Little was effected, however, until 1736, when the king of Naples took the matter in hand, and all done since has been under the direction of government.

"The distance of Pompeii from the base of the mountain is such, that the streams of lava did not reach it. A bed, or rather a succession of distinct layers, of pumice stone, ashes, and cinder, buried the city to the depth of fifteen or twenty feet. The fact that substances were found there, either burned or melted, shows that in some parts of the city there must have been fires, caused probably by the red-hot stones that fell. Pompeii was discovered about 1750, by some peasants who were at work in a vineyard.

"The whole number of skeletons found is about three hundred, of which sixty-three were in what is called the Forum Nundinanium, or more commonly the Barracks. Thirty-four were in a single group, and

the rest scattered here and there. It is supposed, from the armor near and upon them, that these were soldiers, who, knowing that by the Roman law death was the penalty of leaving their stations, died at their posts.

"The temple of Isis is a place of much interest, not only from its perfect preservation, but also from the numerous distinct relics found there of its former occupants, and the religious rites which they practised. The priests were probably dining when the eruption occurred, as in one of the apartments a table was found, with a human skeleton near it, and the bones of fowls and fish, a faded garland of flowers, eating utensils, and the remains of eggs, bread, and wine. Another skeleton was leaning against the wall, with the axe used in sacrifices in his hand; while others near had the same instrument, probably with the design of cutting through the door, that thus they might escape. One of these priests seems to have attempted to carry off the treasures of the temple, but was overwhelmed near the Tragic Theatre. Beside his skeleton were found three hundred and sixty coins of silver, forty-two of bronze, and eight of gold, all secured in a cloth so strong as to have sustained no injury during the seventeen centuries which they had been there.

"In one place were four skeletons embracing each other, supposed to be those of a mother and her three children, who clung to each other for security in that wild and fearful hour of sudden and awful destruction. In another place were the bones of a lady, who had perished with her rings and other ornaments upon her, while scattered around were her costly mirrors, and various other articles of luxury and pride, which she used in gratifying her taste and adorning her person. It were easy to fill a volume in pursuing the mournful detail of what was found in this City of the Dead; but suffice it to say, as to those who perished, many of them doubtless preferred the chance of safety there was in continuing in their houses, to the imminent danger there was in exposing themselves during the awful darkness which prevailed, to the deadly sulphureous vapors, and the destructive showers of red-hot stones and boiling water, which ever and anon were pouring down.

"The houses of Pompeii were from one to four stories high, built of stone, which was covered with plaster and painted. The roofs were flat, and were broken in by the weight of stones and ashes which fell upon them. The lower stories had small windows, with shutters of wood, while in the second story there was glass in thick, small panes. In some of the baths and public buildings, however, there were large squares of glass, of a fine quality. Most of the paintings, statues, household furniture, ornaments, coins, domestic and religious utensils, surgeon's instruments, and other articles without number, found in these buried cities, may be seen in the vast museum at Naples, called the Studii. Between five and six hundred manuscripts have also been discovered, many of which were in a single small room at Herculaneum. They are unrolled by means of numerous silk threads, passed between the folds of the burnt parchment or papyrus. These are moved by a screw, and as fast as a fold is parted from the mass, it is secured by paper and gum Arabic. The English have, in times past, done much at this business; and though some works of interest have been brought to light, yet I am not aware that any thing of high importance, that is new, has been discovered. I have not time here to describe the spacious Forum and the costly temples of the gods, with their massive

columns, and the altars of pagan sacrifice, just as they were seventeen centuries ago. Nor can we pause to examine the shops and houses, showing, as they do most fully, the habits and domestic economy of the old Romans. A light is thus thrown upon the darkness of the past, such as no other means could supply; and it is with emotions of no common interest that one wanders through this City of the Dead, and marks the traces of those who once were there. He sees the pavements of the streets deeply worn with wheels, as if it had been done but yesterday. The basins of the fountains, and the mouths of stone from which the water poured, are all in their places. He enters the court of a private dwelling; and, raising a small flat slab of marble, he sees the pipes of iron branching off, by which water was carried to the various apartments, and lying by them is the key by which the pipes were opened, and which even now fits well to its place. He wanders through the halls and sleeping apartments of the houses, all unchanged, even to the paintings on the walls, the mosaics of the floors, and the shrines where the household gods were worshipped. In the shops, too, he sees the oven of the bakers, the large earthen jars for oil and wine, the places where food was prepared, and even marks of the cups from which liquors were drank.

"In the barracks at Pompeii, were the skeletons of two soldiers chained to the stocks; and in the vaults of a country house near the city were the bones of seventeen persons, who seem to have fled there to escape from danger. They were found enclosed in an indurated tufa, and in the same way was preserved a perfect cast of a woman, with an infant in her arms. Although the rock fully retained the outline of her form, the bones alone remained: attached to these was a chain of gold, and on her fingers were rings, set with jewels. Thus was she adorned for the embrace of Death; and though near a score of centuries have passed since she was buried there, yet how distinctly does the record of this scene present before the mind, like a thing of yesterday, that dying mother's fond affection for her dying child.

"Fishing nets were very abundant in both cities, and are often quite entire. Linen, with the texture well defined, has been found at Herculaneum; and in a fruit shop, there were vessels full of almonds, chestnuts, walnuts, and other fruit, all retaining their shape. A loaf of bread was also found in a baker's shop, with his name stamped upon it. On the counter of an apothecary was a box of pills, changed into a fine earthy substance, and by the side of it a small roll, apparently prepared to be cut into pills."—Vol. I, pp. 119, 121—123, 129, 130.

We have only to add that the books before us are printed with great correctness, in good type and on fine paper, and are presented to the public in a very attractive style. The first of Mr. Rockwell's volumes is adorned by a very beautiful steel engraving of the colonnade of St. Peter's at Rome.

EDITOR.

ARTICLE VIII.

POEMS BY WILLIAM B. TAPPAN, 1834, 1836, 1840, 1842.

THE recent appearance of a new volume of poetry by Mr. Tappan, furnishes us an occasion to make a few remarks upon his productions. He has already been favorably known to the community for many years. We believe some of his earliest efforts appeared in print as far back as the year 1818. His works have received the seal of public approbation on both sides of the Atlantic. Soon after the first collection of them was made, in a volume containing two hundred and fifty-seven pieces, they called forth from the poet Montgomery the following expressions of sympathy and approval. "You have very agreeably added one to the number of those who constitute my world of contemporary spirits yet in the flesh, but to me known only as intelligences with whom I can hold communion of thought, and interchange of feeling, without the probability, or the necessity, of personal knowledge in this world; though with a hope, not irrational, not unfounded, that amidst the ages of eternity, and among the infinity of joys prepared by the Redeemer for those that love him, we shall see and know as we are known; and have to congratulate each other on 'glory, honor and immortality,' the portion of the blest in the kingdom of heaven, brighter, nobler and more excellent than ever was sought, or won, or entered into the imagination to conceive, by those who gained most of the world, and the good the world has to give, yet found it all too little for their wants. I congratulate you on having devoted, not the first fruits only, but I may say, the successive harvests of your Parnassus, not to the fabled deity and the ideal goddesses that were said of old to rule there, but to the true God, and to his glory in the service of his temple and his people on earth. May you have a present and future reward here, and an eternal one hereafter."

We are proud to rank among our countrymen a poet who has won to himself so many laurels, and who knows so well how to wear them with humility and Christian sincerity. Without the advantages of an early classical education, and engaged in common with his fellow-citizens in the daily cares

of business, he has added his name to the list of those who are an honor to the literature of their country. The closet of secret prayer and the worship of the sanctuary, whose devotions he has elevated, and directed, and expressed, are alike indebted to him. He has done a service to the community to which any man might deem it a privilege to aspire. It is an object worthy of man in his best estate to aid his brethren in their approaches to the throne of grace; to kindle in them, as God's instrument, the spirit of divine life and love; to open to them sources of exalted joy; to soothe the mourner; to guide the wayward; to warn the guilty and the thoughtless; to make life cheerful, death happy, piety lovely, and a holy heaven desirable. All this, it seems to us, Mr. Tappan has done by his poetry. An examination of the tables of contents of his four volumes will show that he has an eminent tact in laying hold of subjects for his muse. We are furnished, in the collection of pieces, with an almost endless variety of topics. He lets nothing pass him, unnoticed, in the political or religious world, in Europe or America, in Asia or Africa. He seems to walk the streets with his vigorous mind always on the watch. If he resides in the east or the west, if he travels, or rests in a country village, or stays at home, if he visits a Sabbath school, or attends a strange church, or reads a foreign newspaper, or receives a curious memento from a friend, some poetical idea leaps into being, and a collection of verses often exquisitely beautiful, is sure to come out of it. Occasionally his themes are quaint. Some of his pieces, as they proceed, fill us with an agreeable surprise, bringing out a point which we were by no means prepared to expect. Often he is extremely severe upon individual errors or the sins of the times; yet so much kindness of heart is mingled with his severity, that no one can be offended. But it is on religious themes that he appears to most advantage. In those subjects in which the heart is most likely to be deeply moved, he shows himself eminently at home. As soon as a religious air is given to any topic, the sweet solemnity, the strong faith, the triumphing hope of the Christian are immediately open to the view. It is his pieces of sacred poetry, particularly, which have won for him his fame, and on which his claim to a literary immortality must rest. His other pieces, of whatever character they may be, produce a temporary gratification; but it is in these that his name will survive with a refreshing

fragrance to other generations. There is something in the heart which responds at once to the strains of religious melody. Few are they who are not affected by it. Even those who move in the circles of frivolity and fashion, and those who have become debased by sin, are often melted to penitence by sacred poetry, acting on a susceptible soul, and sent home by God's Holy Spirit.

"It is," says the poet Edmeston, "a pleasant thought, that the English language in both hemispheres is more honored than any other, in extending the knowledge and showing forth the glory of God; and in this country (England) it is a pleasing sign of the times, that sacred poetry, should be so much prized in those gay and noble circles, which once could tolerate only a very different kind of literature. It is a great point to get a hearing for religion; and when once it catches the ear and is listened to, it speaks so truly to the heart, that man will generally receive it, as the consolation and hope which, of all things, he most requires. It is the object of Satan to prevent this acceptance, to keep men out of the way of hearing or reading; but I always find that the music of sacred poetry is a powerful attraction to a cultivated mind; and hence the table of the drawing-room may now often be observed with volumes of sacred poetry, in houses where formerly no such thing could be found."

That which Edmeston has asserted of England, we believe to be substantially true also of our own country. And it is therefore that we welcome with unfeigned pleasure the productions of Mr. T., for his own sake and for our fellow-citizens. We see in them promise of lasting fame for him; and, we trust, by the blessing of God, a prospect of consolation, and conversion, and improvement, for them.

We are glad to perceive that Mr. T.'s views of life and his estimate of the world are generally correct. Persons whose temperament leads them to indulge very freely in the writing or the reading of poetry, often err in this respect. They have a great deal to say about a cold world, the absence of comfort, disappointment, trial and tears, and either the blissful tranquillity, or the chilling gloom of the grave, according to the mood which they happen to be in. Henry Kirke White abounds in such things. But we protest against such views. They are mere exaggerations. There is a deficiency of truth in them. We believe they exert a pernicious influence on

many minds. They sometimes sow the seeds of melancholy in many bosoms, before light and joyous, which in due time bring forth a baneful harvest, either of unhappiness, or of premature decay and death. Mr. T. takes other views of God and the world. To him the sun shines brightly ; the air is full of music ; the earth teems with abundance ; the world is full of the tokens of God's goodness, and of sources of human enjoyment. He views every thing on the bright side. We admire his spirit of cheerful piety. But he renders to God no more than that which is his due.

If our limits would suffice, we should be happy to present some views on several themes, which are suggested by the topic before us. What constitutes a poet ? Wherein does he differ from other men ? Why are not all men poets ? What qualities conduce to poetical excellence ? But for the present these points must be dismissed.

On the received theory,—*poeta nascitur, non fit*,—it is possible to imagine that a poet, as such, is incapable of improvement. This, however, was not, we presume, the meaning of the author of that maxim ; nor do we suppose that anything more is to be understood by it, than the existence of the *elements* of poetry in the constitution of some men, but not in others. Yet in comparing the earlier and later productions of our distinguished poets, we often find some of their earliest efforts among their best. There is no such improvement in their style, their choice of words, the melody of their rhyme, or in any other respect, as we find in the style of prose writers. If it be not invidious, we should say there is no very striking evidence of improvement in the poetry of Mr. T. He is like the bird, whose first nest is built as skilfully as her last. We doubt if he has ever excelled his beautiful piece, which was among his first, "There is an hour of peaceful rest," &c. Perhaps the improvement made by poets may be in their augmented susceptibility of the sublime and beautiful, in the greater delicacy of their taste, in their more discriminating judgment, in their quicker apprehension, in their wider range of thought, in their greater ability to select and appropriate materials for their own use. In these things we do not suspect our author of being deficient.

As we have fallen upon the subject of defects, we may be permitted to say, that, notwithstanding the high meed of praise which we have awarded to the poems of Mr. T., they

are not wholly faultless. We find occasionally a mispronunciation of Latin names. Thus in Vol. I, p. 226, we have *manes*, departed spirits, used as a word of one syllable, instead of two. In III, p. 45, "Cleopatra" is accented on the antepenult, instead of the penult. There is an occasional mark of carelessness. In Vol. I, p. 54, we are told that the "low moan" of the sea

"Steals on the rapt soul like the songs of the blest."

It is a fair question whether "the songs of the blest" resemble "a low moan." On p. 25, Vol. I, we have the phrase "returnless bourne." *Bourne* signifies *bound* or *limit*. We can say, a man returns, or does not return, from the limit, but not that a limit returns, or is returnless. We have the active verb *illumine* or *illumine*, used two or three times, where a neuter verb is needed, like *shine*. On p. 121, Vol. I, the sensitive plant is apostrophized as a "sweetly blushing flower, in sweets arrayed," with the additional implication that it is the *blossom*, which is peculiarly sensitive. If our memory of botanical matters serves us, it is not the blossom of the plant, but its green pinnate leaves, which shrink from the touch; and instead of being "in sweets arrayed," it is nearly odorless. In several instances, the accent in a line falls on the wrong syllable,—a defect which is of little consequence in pieces that are to be read; but, as our music is constructed, a misfortune in a piece that is to be sung. Personal and private incidents may occasionally be interwoven in books of poems with great effect. In almost every instance where they occur in these volumes, they give us pleasure. They are the beautiful effusion of a frank, parental heart. We cannot resist the temptation to copy the following very sweet example from Vol. III, p. 195.

"TO MY LITTLE SON, TWO MONTHS OLD.

"They said that I should give to thee,
The name thy elder brother wore,—
Thy absent brother, whom my knee
Hath dandled, whom I hold no more.
I cannot give thy brother's name
To thee, my little infant son!
In dust he sleepeth, yet the same
He seems, as either precious one
Of those that still remain with me:
I cannot give his name to thee;

The name thy elder brother wore,
 The plaything on our parlor floor,
 Who with us is no longer seen,—
 Oh, no! I call thee not Eugene!
 'T would seem to blot him from his place,—
 Though he, to fill our bitter cup,
 Hath died, I cannot thus efface
 His memory. No! I reckon up,
 With these dear children, the loved others
 Who slumber in their early graves,
 As mine. I cite their several names—
 The buried with their living brothers,
 And sister which my Maker gave;
 And love as well the absent claims
 As those around my fireside seen,—
 Oh, no! I call thee not Eugene!"

We cannot speak so well of a piece on page 60, Vol. II. It partakes too much of an amatory character. In two instances which we have noticed. Mr. T. uses the word *banneret*, as if it had the signification of the similarly-sounding word, *banner*.

"Unfurl the banneret
 On other shores."—Vol. I, p. 296.

"Saw ye not the proud banneret, gory?"—Vol. II, p. 320.

Possibly he may have seen authorities for such a use of the term. Our own references give it a different meaning. Walker's only definition is, "a knight made in the field." The *Encyclopædia Americana* says, "Banneret, in England, was a knight made in the field, with the ceremony of cutting off the point of his standard, and making it a banner."

We are not quite certain but a higher degree of perfection might be reached by our respected friend, were he occasionally to devote more labor and time to a piece. Different authors have their own peculiarities in this respect. Some never improve an article by retaining it; but if they make alterations, they return again to the original. Others bestow great labor on their productions, and by that very labor seem to us to lay the foundation of their immortality. Horace writes of the *labor limæ*. Terence complained that the last touch of the file was wanting to his works. Virgil was seven years in writing his *Georgics*. Gray devoted eleven years to his *Elegy*. Cowper says he never accomplished more than thirteen lines at a sitting. The manuscripts of Pope were often so blotted as to be unintelligible. Byron confessed that his most lively passages were "slowly and painfully elaborated."

And, among prose writers, Hume wrote his History over three times, before he sent it to the press. The immortal work of Gibbon was the labor of seven years. Dr. Blair is said to have given a week to his shortest sermon. Butler was thirty years in composing his Analogy.

But we forbear farther criticisms of this sort. An extract or two from the several volumes must be permitted to enrich our pages, before we close this article. The following burst of sublimity is not excelled in any language.

"THE PETITION.

"First Cause! The Good! Almighty! Thou!
The Dread, Mysterious, Alone!
The rightful King, the wondrous Now!
The Past, the Future, the Unknown.

Thou art!—O Thou! the formless years
Of an eternity are thine;
Thy Essence, One, Triune, appears,—
All time, all space, with Thee combine.

Though terrors shroud, O Thou! thy way,
Though thunders dwell beneath thy feet,
Thy glory beams, with kindly ray,
Around the blessed mercy seat.

Help me, O Thou!—'tis Thou alone,
Canst touch my lips with living fire;
Though frail, I would approach thy throne;
Though dust, would reach an angel's lyre.

Yet help me, Sovereign! and control
Thy subject's wish and thought to Thee!
And oh, accept the contrite soul,—
The offering dear to Deity."

As a specimen of Mr. T.'s manner of turning every thing to some account, as a poet, and of the lovely religious air which often clothes his articles, the spontaneous effect of his piety of heart, we add the following:

"A THOUGHT IN NONANTUM VALE, BRIGHTON.

"I walk among these plants and flowers,—
The air is charged with sweets;
I live, as this Arabian gale
My fainting spirit greets.

I go:—my garments bear away
The fragrance on them laid;

And with their many-voiced perfumes
Tell where to-day I've strayed.

And so the soul that seeks delight
In interview with God,
And hath his garden of sweet spice,
Myrrh, aloes, cassia, trod ;—

Will find, wherever he may go,
That fragrance with him stay ;
And heaven still lingering on his steps,—
More odorous than May."

We will intrude upon the patience of our readers only one more extract. It is marked by so elevated and evangelical a spirit, is so simple and natural in its structure and thought, and presents so fine an example of the tact and piquancy of the author's manner, that we should scarcely do him justice, were we to omit it, unless some kindred specimen, of which, in his four volumes we could find many more, were to stand in its place. It has reference to the Rev. Samuel H. Stearns, late pastor of the Old South Church in Boston, a young man of great promise, who went to Europe in pursuit of health ; but died at Paris, and his remains were brought home for interment in Mount Auburn.

"Room in Mount Auburn!—for the traveller room!
Who comes from pilgrimage to seek a tomb.
Where throng the wise, the gifted, holy dead,
The greatly wept for, *he* should lay his head.
And the same spotless robe that winter throws
On these, should wrap *him* in a kind repose.
The same sweet warblings when the small birds grieve,
The same fair flowers that early May will weave,
Shall be for *him*,—none nobler, purer, rest
Until the resurrection of the blest.
Room! Room! for him, who, seeking distant Seine,
Discovered rivers fringed with heavenly green ;
Who went for life and gained it,—yielding breath,
Life, everlasting Life, he found in death."

EDITOR.

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *The Great Awakening. A History of the Revival of Religion in the time of Edwards and Whitefield.* By JOSEPH TRACY. Boston. Tappan and Dennet. 1842. pp. 433, large 12mo.

We expected to have been able to give, in the present number of the Review, an extended article on this valuable work. In the absence of such an article, we must content ourselves with the brief notice which our limits will permit. The period and the phase of the ecclesiastical history of New England here presented to us, is the most interesting that could be portrayed. It is second in value and importance to no other, unless it be to the history of the events which led to the founding of the New England colonies, and their early progress in religion and literature. The aspect of religious affairs was wholly changed by the events narrated. A more rigid test of church-membership was introduced, and more evangelical views concerning the nature of spiritual religion were propagated and entertained, as a result of the wonderful work of grace which then prevailed. The influence of that revival has never been wholly extinguished. We trust it never will be. We hail with pleasure this attempt to restore the traces of it which, in the interval, have partially faded. Mr. Tracy found abundant materials for his work. Among these Mr. Prince's "Christian History" was the chief. Besides this, were Whitefield's own account of his life, his journals and letters, Edwards's "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England in 1740," and about one hundred pamphlets, published during the revival, or soon after. The work furnishes a very full account of the life, labors, and successes of Whitefield, the character and influence of Davenport, the peculiar characteristics of the revival, the means of its promotion, the style of preaching which was most useful, and the influences which, in any instances, retarded or corrupted the work. By means of notes and journals, written at the time of the excitement, the reader is made, as much as possible, to live, as it were, in the period to which the history alludes. The book is enriched by portraits of Whitefield, Gilbert Tennent, and Sewall. We are glad to learn that within three months from its appearance, it has reached a second edition. As a companion to Sprague's excellent "Lectures on Revivals," we regard it as a very important addition to our ministerial libraries. It needs to be read, especially by young and inexperienced ministers, with such an associate; lest the errors of the last century should be revived in this, and with far more disastrous consequences. The revival of which we here have an account, makes it evident that, while in some things the character of the age was stamped upon the work, and, in another age some of the characteristics of the revival of that age would not re-appear, yet the work was by the same Spirit, on minds similarly constructed, through similar instruments, and accompanied by kindred results.

2. *History of the Great Reformation of the sixteenth century in Germany, Switzerland, &c.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE. Vol. III. New York. Robert Carter. 1842. pp. 504, 12mo.

This third volume of D'Aubigné's great work fully sustains his well-earned reputation. The expectations of those who read with interest his two former volumes are abundantly met. By the examination of original documents in the library of Paris, and in the library of the conclave of pastors of Neufchatel, he has been enabled to introduce into his history many new facts. The work is entertaining and instructive; at the same time fitted to be read, in course, with lively interest, and afterwards to be used for frequent consultation, as a vast repository of facts, belonging to, and illustrative of, the period which it describes.

3. *Theopneusty, or the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* By S. R. L. GAUSSEN. Translated from the French, by Rev. E. N. Kirk. New York. J. S. Taylor and Co. 1842.

This subject is one of too high importance to be overrated. It lies at the basis of our evangelical faith. If the Scriptures are not strictly the word of God, our faith is without foundation. Whatever item of our creed is assailed, it is to this that we must flee for its confirmation. The work before us goes very thoroughly into the subject, and takes very sound views of it. M. Gausсен is associated with M. Merle D'Aubigné, in the Institution at Geneva; and that ancient stronghold of truth may well exult in the honor of holding two such able and efficient champions of the doctrines of the Reformation. Mr. Kirk has done well in presenting the ministry of our country with so acceptable a fruit of his foreign tour. If every professional American, visiting the continent of Europe, would furnish us, on his return, with so honorable a testimony to his "profiting" during his absence from home, we could more willingly consent to the interruption, for a season, of the pleasures of social intercourse. The temporary loss would be more than compensated by the permanent benefit. We beg leave to protest against this new word,—Theopneusty,—which, in the title of this work, has sought admission into the English language. We doubt its claim to a place. Although, etymologically considered, it describes the Author of inspiration, as well as the fact of it,—which our common term, "inspiration," does not,—yet by long usage in the sense of inspiration from God, our common word is to the ear of the public generally quite as expressive, and a great deal more intelligible. We are no enemies to the enrichment of our native tongue by any words which the necessities of theology, or of any art or profession may demand. But we believe that new words ought not to be coined, when we already have old and approved words, which bear precisely the same signification as the new ones.

4. *The works of Jonathan Edwards, D. D., late President of Union College, with a Memoir of his Life and Character.* By TRYON EDWARDS. In two vols. pp. 519, 556. Andover. Allen, Morrill, and Wardwell. 1842.

These are the works of President Edwards, commonly called, the younger. Some of them have already been among standard authorities

for many years. We refer particularly to his "Salvation of all men, strictly examined, in reply to the reasonings of Dr. Chauncey," and "A Dissertation concerning Liberty and Necessity, in reply to Dr. Samuel West." The present volumes contain these, with his other published works, and a considerable number of sermons, edited from his manuscripts. In his religious views and in the habit of his mind, the younger President Edwards followed in the steps of his celebrated father. There is an interesting parallel drawn between the father and son in the *Christian Spectator* for January, 1823. Dr. Emmons was accustomed to say that the senior president had more reason than his son; but the son was a better reasoner than his father. The writer before alluded to remarks: "We have said that, in our opinion, the first President Edwards was a greater man than the second; but if the father had higher powers of invention, the son was perhaps most dexterous and acute as a logician. If the former could dive deeper, and draw up more pearls from the bottom, he could not arrange them, when procured, with greater skill and advantage than the latter. If his eye was more excursive, it was not keener. If he could lift the telescope easier, we doubt whether he could manage the microscope quite so well." It is interesting to observe the marks of resemblance which existed in the father and the son; and to trace the influence of the former, in moulding the character of the latter. The second volume is entirely occupied by sermons, and essays written for the *Theological Magazine*. His style is formed on the model of his father's, plain and forcible. One of his sermons (Vol. 2, p. 124), which was preached as the annual *Concio ad Clerum* at Yale College in New Haven, Sept., 1792, on the Marriage of a Wife's Sister, is deserving of serious attention. Without affirming or denying the truth of his positions, we simply state that he decides that it is unlawful, according to the express revelation of God; and he sustains his position by a series of earnest reasoning. The volumes are in good type and handsomely bound.

5. *Sermons and Sketches of Sermons*, by the Rev. JOHN SUMMERFIELD, A. M., late a preacher in connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church. With an Introduction by the Rev. THOMAS BOND, M. D. New York: Harpers. 1842. pp. 437. 8vo.

The public will easily remember how high promise of extensive usefulness was given a few years since, by this young clergyman. His extraordinary zeal and eloquence enchained his hearers, as if by some magic power. But he fell, an early victim to his severe and imprudent labors. We say severe labors; for although he did not preach from a manuscript, he was accustomed, after the delivery of a sermon, to return home and write it out in full. His studies were continued, even before he entered the ministry, sixteen hours a day,—from four in the morning till eight at night. He was of a frail body and delicate constitution. And though he commenced preaching before he reached the age of twenty years, yet he often preached five, seven, and even ten times in a week. In the first eighteen months of his ministry, he preached four hundred sermons, besides delivering addresses on various occasions. James Montgomery, the poet, after having examined a volume of his sermons in manuscript, remarked of them, "Though but *studies*, they are exceedingly methodical in plan; and in execution, they are distinguished chiefly by sound doctrine, exact judgment and severe absti-

nence from ornament." The sermons occasionally bring to light the peculiar views of the author's denomination. But, aside from this, we think they will be read with pleasure. They suggest many new and striking thoughts, which is a special token of their excellence. Probably, like the sermons of Whitefield and of other eminent preachers, we cannot fully estimate the man, nor determine the real effectiveness of his sermons, without having heard them from his own lips. The publishers deserve our thanks for giving us, in so fine a volume, the means of gratifying our curiosity concerning that wonderful young man.

6. *The Anxious Inquirer after Salvation.* By REV. JOHN ANGEL JAMES, Birmingham, Eng. Published by the American Tract Society, 1842.

This little book has been before the public for a considerable period, and has already established its claim to general approbation. Its recent issue under the sanction of the Tract Society, in an inviting form, is specially timely. It is adapted to meet the wants of those for whom it is written. It is a calm and faithful exhibition of the way of salvation, which the anxious inquirer may safely follow. Between two and three hundred thousand copies of it have been already issued; and it has been translated into Welsh, French, Gaelic, German, and is now to be translated into Swedish. Mr. James remarks concerning it, "I feel that had I done nothing more than come into existence to write that little work, I have lived to great purpose"—such have been the tokens of favor with which God has been pleased to attend its perusal. May the demand for this and kindred works continue, and be increased a thousand fold.

7. *The Way of Life.* By CHARLES HODGE, professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. Written for the American Sunday School Union. 1842. pp. 343. 12mo.

This, like the preceding, is a very seasonable exhibition of the way of life. But it is designed to commence with an earlier period in the experience of those who are to be benefited by it. It aims to lift the skeptic from his abyss, and to lead him by a sure and safe path to the celestial city. The publishing Committee of the Union had long felt the want of a book, solving the questions—Are the Scriptures really a revelation from God? If they are, what doctrines do they teach; and what influence should those doctrines exert on our heart and life? They wished for a book suitable to be placed in the hands of intelligent and educated young persons, either to arouse their attention, or to guide their steps in the way of life. The Committee were fortunate in enlisting the pen of Prof. Hodge. To all who are familiar with his excellent Commentary on the Romans, his name will be a sufficient guaranty for the logical method and the evangelical sentiments of the work. He shows, first, that the Scriptures are the word of God, from external and internal evidence, and the fulfilment of prophecy. His next object is to exhibit the teachings of the Scriptures with regard to the character of men, the way of salvation, and the rule of duty. He shows that men, since the fall, are depraved; and that their sins are both numerous and aggravated. He explains the causes of men's indifference to the charge of being sinners; presents the subject of conviction of sin, the nature and method of justification, faith, repentance,

the importance of a profession of religion, the nature and obligation of the Christian ordinances, the nature of true piety and the means of sanctification. Each of these subjects is discussed in a lucid and powerful manner. We are pleased to notice that in his remarks on baptism, though, in his ministerial character and his official relations, he advocates a theory different from our own, yet in this work, the whole tenor of his statement seems to take it for granted that baptism is the voluntary, intelligent act of believers only. An impartial inquiry into the nature and design of baptism, it seems to us, can scarcely lead to any other views than these. The truly evangelical spirit which pervades the book is very cheering to those who have walked in this way of life, and tested it by personal experience. The book is handsomely printed and bound, and has a pretty vignette title-page, besides a very beautiful frontispiece, representing the way of life, with the celestial city at its termination, and several pilgrims, in the white robes of Christ's righteousness, pursuing their shining path to the "holy hill."

8. *The Claims of Jesus*. By ROBERT TURNBULL, pastor of Boylston Church, Boston. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1841. pp. 120. 12mo.

A mild and affectionate treatise on the character and claims of Christ. The author takes the evangelical view of the question. He states the argument in a concise and conclusive, though not controversial manner. He first presents an account of Jesus as he appeared, a man, among men, calling attention to the several traits of his character in that relation; then, he exhibits his higher nature, showing him, by incontestible proofs, to have been at once both man and God. In his third chapter he meets the objections to the evangelical theory, and shows the connection of the divinity of Christ with the doctrine of atonement; and closes, in the fourth, by enforcing the claims of Jesus, as divine, to be acknowledged, adored and obeyed, as our prophet, priest, and king. The book is written, generally, in a neat and attractive style, occasionally highly impassioned, as one might be expected to write, who had thoroughly imbued his mind with the grandeur of such a theme. We hope the work will meet the general circulation of which it is worthy; and, in a quiet and unobtrusive manner, guide the wavering to right views concerning "the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

9. *The Millennium of the Apocalypse*. By GEORGE BUSH, professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in the N. Y. University. Second Edition. Salem: John P. Jewett.

Prof. Bush published the first edition of this work several years since. He remarks in his preface, that having gone through with his investigations afresh, he has seen cause to make but very slight alterations. The work is adapted to the times. Prof. B. has evidently studied his subject very thoroughly, and made an independent examination of the passages of Scripture which have a bearing upon his point. He supposes the New Testament millennium to be on the eve of its termination. We are not fully prepared to adopt his peculiar and ingenious theory, though respectable quotations from ancient authors are brought to sustain it. But whatever may be thought of this, the volume states and illustrates some principles of interpretation, which are highly worthy of attention. It is certainly remarkable that views so discordant one with another have been entertained concerning this prophetic por-

tion of Scripture, at different times, and by persons of respectable abilities and profound learning. The fact suggests the importance of a more thorough and intelligent study of the prophetic books, under the guidance of right principles of exegesis, with the aid of extensive literary acquisitions, and especially with fervent prayer for the illuminating influences of the Holy Spirit.

10. *Emily, and other Poems.* By J. N. BROWN. Concord, N. H. Israel S. Boyd. pp. 276. 12mo.

Mr. Brown has a warm and affectionate heart, and a susceptibility to the refined and the beautiful,—traits which belong to the true poet, and without which true poetry is out of the question. The volume contains many pieces which give fair promise. The whole collection belongs to Mr. B.'s early efforts. Several of his productions have been extremely well received, and are worthy of a place among the specimens of our religious literature. Nearly the whole edition is sold. Mr. B. has made some progress in a larger poem, called the Apocalypse, being a versification of the sublime visions of the apostle John. A part of it was published a few years since in a separate pamphlet, containing some passages of true poetic fire.

11. *The Holy Bible; being the English version of the Old and New Testaments, made by order of King James I.* Carefully revised and amended by several Biblical scholars. Second edition. Philadelphia. Published for David Bernard, by J. B. Lippincott. 1842.

[This work has been under announcement for several years. Our thanks are due to the proprietor for a copy of it, beautifully printed and elegantly bound. It is designed as an improvement on King James' Bible, the antique words and forms of our language being expunged, and modern ones substituted; renderings, which are supposed to be erroneous, corrected; a uniformity, to some extent, being given to the translation of words which frequently recur; a uniform spelling, to the same words, wherever they appear; and every word *translated*, as the publisher and his editors designed, instead of being transferred from the original language into the English. Thus whenever the יהוה occurs in the Old Testament, it is here rendered "Jehovah," and not "the LORD," as is often the case in the received version. "Αἰώνιος is not rendered at one time *everlasting*, and at another *eternal*, but always by the same form. For *leasing* we have substituted the modern *falsehood*. Many prepositions are altered. Scarcely can ten verses be found together, which have not been in some way or other changed. *Baptize*, in all its forms, is rendered *immerse*; and, probably, on this account, the work has been by some announced as the Baptist Bible. But we protest against any such appropriation. It is not a Baptist Bible. The Baptist denomination have never sanctioned it. We predict, they will never adopt it. The publisher distinctly declares in his preface that the work is a private enterprise, for which he alone is responsible. It is true, the name of one of the esteemed professors of the Hamilton Institution is appended to the introduction to the New Testament. But the officers of the Hamilton Institution assume no responsibility in reference to it. While they highly respect the critical ability and the upright motives of Mr. Kenrick, they regret as much as we do, any issue from the press, which is capable of being

construed, by the uninformed, into a denominational effort to supplant the received translation by one more favorable to our own cause. We need no such aid. The Bible, as it is, is sufficiently favorable to our cause. Its words are enshrined in our hearts, and we ask no alteration. Even its few antiquated forms are a beautiful monument of the English language, as it was in the days of King James. We question, moreover, if much is gained by some of the more striking changes. The word *baptize*, for example, is changed to *immerse*, as if that were an improvement. But while the bare meaning of *baptize* is *to immerse*, it is a fair question, whether the term, as applied to our Christian ordinance, does not involve the idea of the *emersion*, as well as of the *immersion*. "Buried with Christ," says the apostle, "in baptism, wherein, also, ye are risen with him to newness of life." And if this be the case, instead of a correction, we have only a diminution of the sense of the sacred writer. We presume the publisher has designed to give to the public a version which shall be to the received version what Van Ess's version in German is to Luther's. But the common translation here, as in Germany, is too fully fixed in the affections of the community to be set aside for one more modern, whatever improvements may be introduced. The work will be valuable as an occasional book of reference, to be used, like commentaries generally, as a means of discovering the sense of passages in the opinion of the authors of this work; as we consult with much profit, Macknight and Doddridge's paraphrases, Prof. Stuart's translation of the Romans and the Hebrews, in the commentaries written by him on those epistles, Gesenius's translation of Isaiah, which is itself a good commentary, and the like. But for any thing further than this, we neither expect nor wish to see the work circulated among us.

12. *The Great Commission*, or the Christian Church constituted and charged to convey the gospel to the world. By Rev. JOHN HARRIS, D. D. With an Introductory Essay, by Rev. W. R. WILLIAMS, D. D. Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln. pp. 482. 12mo.

We have only room to say that this anticipated volume has just appeared. It is divided into the following sections. Part I. The Missionary Enterprise viewed generally in its relation to the word of God. Part II. The Benefits of the Missionary Enterprise. Part III. Encouragements to prosecute the work. Part IV. Objections to the Missionary Enterprise. Part V. The wants of the Christian church, as a Missionary Society examined. Part VI. Motives to enforce entire devotedness to the Missionary Enterprise. The Introductory Essay is of the same high character as every thing which proceeds from its accomplished author. An extended review of the work may be expected in our next number.

13. *The Bible and the Closet*; or, how we may read the Bible with the most spiritual profit; and, secret prayer successfully managed. By ministers ejected in 1662. Edited by J. O. CHOULES.

This neat miniature volume forms the first of a second series by the same publishers. It is elegantly bound in silk, with gilt edges. The reading, from the old Puritans, is as pure gold as that which adorns the exterior. The first series, of which four numbers are published, comprises smaller volumes, of great beauty—an appropriate present for the use of those who would obey the injunction, "Feed my lambs."

ARTICLE X.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

Baptist General Convention for Foreign Missions.—The annual meeting of the Board was held in New York city, April 27, 1842. The receipts from auxiliaries and individuals, and interest on loans, amounted to \$52,137 10, for the year ending April 1, 1842, and the expenditures to \$57,793 94. Excess of expenditures above receipts, \$5,656 84. Of this sum, \$4,400 was received from the U. S. government for Indian schools; and \$14,654 45 from churches, and from various benevolent institutions. The missions of the Board are in Burmah, Western Africa, Siam and China, Arracan, Asam, and among the Teloogoos; in France, Germany, Denmark and Greece, and among the North American Indians. The gospel by Matthew has been printed in Shawanoe and Ottawa, besides other publications in Shawanoe and Delaware. Whole number of copies printed the last season, 3,300, and of pages, 171,100. 175,000 tracts have been issued in German and in Danish, and about 2000 Bibles; 5000 Danish Testaments and 5000 German Bibles have also been printed. The printing department at Maulmain was in operation only a small part of the year, on account of the supply of books on hand. Nine thousand volumes of Scriptures, containing 5,172,000 pages, were printed, and 6000 copies of tracts, or 636,000 pages. The whole number of pages printed at the Maulmain press, from the beginning, is 67,773,000. Two thousand copies of Matthew have been printed in Asamese, and 9000 copies of tracts, including Worcester's Primer in Naga; also two Shyan tracts. A large quantity of tracts have been distributed. The Board has in charge 20 missions, 100 stations and out stations, 45 American missionaries or preachers, 54 assistant missionaries, 111 native preachers and assistants, 43 schools, 877 scholars, 77 churches, and 3709 members of churches. The number of baptisms reported the past year is 780. Five missionaries and assistant missionaries have died during the conventional year. The foreign secretaryship has been assigned to Rev. Solomon Peck, and the home secretaryship to Rev. Robert E. Pattison, D. D. The latter entered on his duties as a corresponding secretary, April 1, at which time the home department was resigned by the senior corresponding secretary, Rev. Dr. Bolles.

The American Baptist Home Mission Society held its tenth anniversary in New York, April 26. By the treasurer's report it appears that the total amount of receipts for home missions, including those of the auxiliaries, the past year, is \$57,154 72. The whole number of agents and missionaries who have acted under the commissions of the Society, the past year, is ninety-seven. These have been employed in twenty of the United States and territories, in Canada and Texas. They have occupied steadily more than 325 stations, preached 9,485 sermons, delivered 678 public addresses on various subjects of Christian benevolence, made 8,055 pastoral visits, and 145 visits to schools. In the performance of these duties they have travelled 111,688 miles. Their joint labors amount to 133 years for one man. They have occupied more than 336 stations, preached 24,124 sermons, made 24,452 pastoral visits, and travelled, in the performance of their labors, 60,377 miles. Total, 367 agents and missionaries, 33,609 sermons preached, 200 years' labor, and 172,065 miles travelled. The amount of ordinary ministerial labor performed by them is equal to that of one man sixty-seven and a half years.

In addition to the above, a vast amount of labor has been performed by them in protracted meetings, and meetings for moral improvement, in Bible and tract distribution, and in organizing and aiding Sabbath schools, temperance and other benevolent societies. The missionaries of the Society report the baptism of 1,495, the organization of thirty-six churches, and the ordination of sixteen ministers. Under their supervision or influence 4,654 pupils have been instructed in Sabbath schools and Bible classes, by 589 teachers. Among the churches aided, four meeting-houses have been completed, and the erection of thirteen others has been commenced. Two churches have become able to sustain themselves without further missionary aid. From forty-two of the churches \$2,798 61 have been paid for benevolent purposes. In the entire number aided, are twenty-eight young men preparing for the ministry. The missionaries of auxiliaries report the baptism of 2,727 persons, making a total of 4,222 baptisms.

The American and Foreign Bible Society held its fifth anniversary April 26. The amount of all receipts the past year is \$25,692 50. Of this sum \$13,320 has been appropriated to printing and circulating the Scriptures in foreign lands. Number of new auxiliary societies recognized during the year, eleven. Life-members and life-directors added to the list, 120. Volumes presented to the Biblical library, 146. Whole number of volumes in the library, 623. Amount of labor performed by travelling agents, thirty-eight months. Two editions of the English Bible were printed during the year, embracing 5,000 copies.

The Baptist Publication Society held its third anniversary April 27. The receipts of the Society the past year have been \$12,788 95, and the expenditures \$12,489 12. About \$1,700 of the receipts were donations to the Society. The remainder has accrued from the sale of books, the Baptist Record, or has merely passed through this Society as a channel of other institutions and objects.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

A Grammar of the Turkish Language, by Major Charles Boyd, has just appeared in London.—Also, a volume on Modern French Literature, by L. Raymond de Véricour, formerly lecturer in the Royal Athenæum in Paris.—Murray has brought out, in 2 vols., a Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland, by Count Valerian Krasinski.—We see advertised, also, the Martyr of Erromanga, or the Philosophy of Missions, illustrated by the labors, death and character of the late Rev. John Williams, by Rev. John Campbell, D. D. Instead of containing the usual details of conversions, &c., it is written in the form of letters to those persons or institutions, who are supposed to be most deeply concerned in the topics discussed in the different parts. Thus, letter first is addressed to the teachers of British and other schools. Another, containing an account of the results of missions on the interests of time, is addressed to Sir T. F. Buxton, James Douglas, of Cavers, and Lord Brougham.—A work on Christian Missions to the heathen nations has, also, just come from the pen of the Rev. Baptist W. Noel.—Joseph Sturge has given to the public an account of his visit, a year since, to the United States. It is spoken of as a calm and impartial work. We should judge, however, from a specimen of its contents, given in one of the London Reviews, that it is not without some palpable mis-statements.—Bagster & Sons have published an edition of "The Famous Genevan Testament," containing "diversities of readings, and most profitable annotations of

harde places." This translation was the work of a number of the principal Reformers, who were driven to Geneva by the persecutions in the reign of Queen Mary. The first edition was printed in 1557, by Conrad Badius; and was the first in our language containing the divisions of the verses. A second edition was printed in 1560, with short marginal notes.

GERMANY.

Hengstenberg published in 1841 a work, entitled the books of Moses and Egypt, which promises for the reading of Genesis great value; also, now quite lately, a volume consisting of the interpretation of difficult passages of the Old Testament. This volume is the first of a series, and discusses the history of Balaam and his prophecies.—Bernhardy is bringing out the second and last volume of his history of Greek literature, which, like every thing from him, will be of the highest order.—Olshausen's posthumous works, Commentaries on the Epistles, have been published, and are among the best exegetical works which we now have.—Winer published in 1840, the second volume of his Handbook of Theological literature, full of minute statistical learning; also, the present year, a small Chaldee Grammar.—Ewald and Umbreit have each brought out a Commentary on Isaiah.—Stephanus' Greek Thesaurus, by the Dindorffs, has appeared in Paris, as far as the letter K.—Hupfeld has, at length, given to the public a Hebrew Grammar, which has been expected for ten years; and which it is supposed will take rank above all that have preceded it. He was a pupil of Gesenius.—A new history of Rome, from the fall of the Republic to Constantine, has appeared at Göttingen, from the pen of Dr. Charles Hoek, a professor in the University there.

SWITZERLAND.

Sargons, of Geneva, is publishing, in a series, a work on the French authors of the Reformation. It is said that the press at Paris is frequently assailing those authors; and this work of Sargons is finely adapted to meet them.

SWEDEN.

A new Review, now the only one in all Sweden, has lately appeared, and promises to become an important guide to the lovers of Swedish literature. Its title is "Frey," and its contents are almost exclusively short notices and opinions of the new publications. Three numbers have appeared.

QUARTERLY LIST.

DEATHS.

MESHACH BROWNING, Green Co., Ill., Jan. 1, aged 38.
 JOSIAH BARKER, Franklin Co., Ala., Jan. 6, aged 51.
 GEORGE H. BLACK, Boston, March 16.
 WILLIAM CORBIN, Logansport, Ia.
 WILLIAM M. DOOLITTLE, Northampton, Ms., Feb. 12, aged 28.
 JOHN HALL, Troy, Ind., Feb. 18.
 N. W. HODGES, Cookham, S. C.
 JESSE L. HOLMAN, Aurora, Ia., March 28.
 WILLIAM KEYS, Missouri, Jan.
 FREDERIC W. MILES, Fredericton, N. B., Feb. 2, aged 35.
 CHARLES H. PEABODY, North Randolph, Mass., April 21, aged 43.
 JOHN PEAK, Boston, April 9, aged 81.
 HADLEY PROCTOR, China, Me., Apr. 12, aged 48.
 WHORTON M. RANSDELL, near Shelbyville, Ky.

CORODEN H. SLAFTER, missionary, Bangkok, Siam, April 17, 1841, aged 30.
 ISAAC TAYLOR, near Bardstown, Ky., March 13, aged 69.
 CHRISTY G. WHEELER, McHenry, Ill., March 23, aged 32.

ORDINATIONS.

RICHARD ANDERSON, St. Louis, Nov. 7.
 THOMAS D. ANDERSON, 1st church, Salem, Mass. March 15.
 JULIUS C. ANGEL, Camden, Lorain Co., O., March 9.
 OLIVER O. BAILEY, Milfield, Southampton Co., Va., April 26.
 L. R. BARNES, Miss., Sept.
 J. R. BARRY, Oneonta, Otsego Co., N. Y., Jan. 20.
 IRA BENEDICT, Mohawk, N. Y., Jan. 26.
 JOSEPH P. BURBANK, West Plattsburg, N. Y., Jan. 12.

- GEORGE BUTLER, Shady Grove, Ky., Jan. 18.
 DAVID CALL, Clearfork, O., April 7.
 E. W. CLARK, Sardinia, N. Y., Feb. 23.
 W. D. CORBIN, Cato, Cayuga Co., N. Y.
 DANIEL CRENSHAW, New Salem, Madison Co., Miss., Nov.
 G. W. DAY, Somerville, Tenn., Oct. 17.
 NATHAN DENISON, Derby, Vt., Feb. 24.
 WILLIAM L. EATON, East Weare, N. H., April 21.
 H. T. FERRO, Wheatfield, Ingham Co., Mich., Jan. 23.
 CALVIN FISHER, Elizabethtown, Essex Co., N. Y., Nov. 25.
 E. S. FREEMAN, Mohican, O., Feb. 23.
 JOHN GARLAND, Union church, Warren Co., Ky., Jan. 19.
 JAMES R. GEORGE, Long Shoal, Geo., April 8.
 JOHN GILBERT, Mt. Clemons, Mich., March 16.
 JOSHUA H. GOSS, Van's Creek, Ruckensville, Geo., April 10.
 CHARLES GRAVES, Martinsburg, Lewis Co., N. Y., Sept. 22.
 SHERMAN S. GRISWOLD, Piscataway, N. Y., Jan. 23.
 NICHOLAS MILLER HAVENS, London Bridge, Va., March 23.
 BENJAMIN F. HEDDING, Groton, Conn., April 21.
 SERENO HOWE, Charlestown, Mass., April 29.
 A. P. HOWELL, Onondaga, Onon. Co., N. Y., Sept. 8.
 CHARLES M. IRWIN, Powelton, Ga., March 5.
 SAMUEL KINGSBURY, Jr., Brooklyn, Vt., Nov. 18.
 V. E. KIRTLY, Frankfort, Ky., Dec. 25.
 HIRAM MAIN, Milford Centre, Otsego Co., N. Y., Jan. 27.
 ROBERT C. MILLS, Colchester, Ct., March 17.
 BELA PALMER, Centreville, Alleghany Co., N. Y., Jan. 19.
 L. PARMELE, Galway, N. Y., Oct. 27.
 AMOS B. PENDLETON, Hope, Me., Dec. 8.
 D. PHILLIPS, Thomaston, Pa., Dec. 9.
 ALFRED PINNEY, Auburn, N. Y., Feb. 10.
 ISAAC A. PITMAN, Burlington Green, Otsego Co., N. Y., April 27.
 Y. R. PITTS, Great Crossings, Ky., Nov. 17.
 JOHN O'QUIN, Chenyville, La.
 JOHN RANSDALE, New Bethel, Marion Co., Ind., Feb. 24.
 JOHN RUSE, near New Albany, Ind., Jan. 22.
 SAMUEL RICHARDS, West Sutton, Mass., March 31.
 JOSEPH RICKER, Portland, Me., May 12.
 J. M. ROCKWOOD, East Rutland, Vt., Feb. 9.
 LAUREL L. ROOT, Butler, Knox Co., O., April 24.
 LADOWICK SALISBURY, West Winfield, Herk. Co., N. Y., May 3.
 MICHAEL SHANK, Milton, Wayne Co., O., Jan. 11.
 JAMES SINCLAIR, Beaver, Guernsey Co., O., March.
 JOSEPH SKAGGS, Union church, Warren Co., Ky., Jan.
 JOSEPH SORSBY, Mound Bluff, Miss., March 14.
 JAMES M. SPURLIN, Chambers Co., Ala., Feb. 23.
 JOHN TROWBRIDGE, Weathersfield, Wyoming Co., N. Y., March 10.
 WILLIAM VERRINDER, Buffalo, N. Y., Feb. 16.
 WILLIAM WADSWORTH, Martinsville, O., April 10.
 JAMES M. WHIPPLE, Hinsdale, Mass., March 17.
 WILLIAM WILLIAMS (colored), Washington, D. C., Jan. 1.
- CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.
 Taylorsville, Hanover Co., Va., Oct. 9, 1841.
 Chester, Randolph Co., Ill., Oct. 10.
 Russell, George Co., O., Oct. 21.
 Oxford, Butler Co., O., Oct. 29.
 Near Clarksburg, Va., Oct. 30.
 New Baptist church, Oxford, O., Oct. 31.
 Savannah, Madison Co., Tenn., Oct.
 Luthersburg, Clearfield Co., Pa., Nov. 1.
 Taukhannock, Luzerne Co., Pa., Nov. 3.
 Lunenburg, Vt., Nov. 4.
 East Nantmead, Chester Co., Pa., Nov. 5.
 Tallahatchee, Miss., Nov.
 Clifford, Susquehanna Co., Pa., Dec. 8.
 Thomaston, Juniata Co., Pa., Dec. 9.
 Hadlyme, Conn., Dec. 16.
 Buffalo River, Monongalia Co., Va., Dec. 19.
 Columbus, Geo., Dec. 19.
 Orange Co., Ind., Jan. 1, 1842.
 Aurora, Me., Jan. 1.
 Hereford, Md., Jan. 5.
 Martin's Hill, Chemung Co., N. Y., Jan. 5.
 Brownville, Ky., Jan. 15.
 Torrington, Conn., Jan. 19.
 Jefferson, Switzerland Co., Ind., Jan. 25.
 Bryant's Creek, Ia., Jan. 26.
 Wheatfield, Ingham Co., Mich., Jan. 23.
 Baton Rouge, La.
 Crittenden, Grant Co., Ky.
 Fairport, Monroe Co., N. Y., Feb. 2.
 Hereford, Va., Feb. 5.
 Rondout, Ulster Co., N. Y., Feb. 7.
 Cushing, Me., Feb. 8.
 Jefferson Co., Ky., Feb. 12.
 Concord, near Fort Wayne, Ind., Feb. 13.
 Belmont, Me., Feb. 20.
 Niagara Falls, N. Y., Feb. 23.
 Jefferson, Adams Co., Ind., Feb.
 Morgantown, Va., Feb.
 Near Smithfield, Fayette Co., Va., Feb.
 Ellington, Conn., Feb.
 Newark, N. J., March 3.
 Lockport, Penn., March 7.
 Bath, Steuben Co., N. Y., March 16.
 Beaver, Guernsey Co., O., March 19.
 Cincinnati, O., 3d church, March 20.
 Poplar Spring, Buckingham Co., Va., March 22.
 Putnam Valley, N. Y., April 7.
 Elk Ridge Landing, Md., April 12.
 West Caln, Chester Co., Pa., April 14.
 East Palamia, N. Y., April 20.
 Newport Village, Me., April 20.
 East Pharsalia, Chenango Co., April 20.
 Conklin, Broome Co., N. Y., April 27.
 Louisville, Ky. (colored), April.
 Lyme, Conn., May 12.
 Richmond, Va., 4th church, May.
- DEDICATIONS.
 Upperville, Fauquier Co., Va., Jan. 15.
 Pontiac, Mich., Feb. 10.
 Broome St., New York city, Feb. 20.
 Henderson, Ky., Feb. 20.
 Tansbury, N. J., Feb.
 Staten Island, March 31.